

HOW FIRM OUR FOUNDATION

Vance Ferrell

1980

An In-depth Scriptural Reply to Desmond Ford's October 27, 1979 Student Forum Lecture at Pacific Union Collage, Entitled, "*There is a Problem Here*"

A Scriptural Vindication of the Faith Delivered to the Pioneers of Our Church.

Quotations from this Lecture are printed in BOLD type face. (Ford's words)

Lecture Reply, "*How Firm Our Foundation*", written as it was set in type, Thursday, March 6 through Tuesday, March 18, 1980, at Harrisburg, Illinois. Material in this Reply is printed in this type face.

"This meeting actually began about thirty five years ago in Sydney, Australia, as an Anglican—or I think you call them Episcopalians over here—in my home in the suburbs. I was reading Hebrews, chapter nine. At that time I was listening to the Advent Radio Church each Sunday, and I had begun to collect the books of Ellen G. White from second-hand book shops around Sydney. And as I was reading Hebrews Nine that day, I said, 'That's strange, this is different than what the Adventists are saying. There is a problem here.' The problem wasn't solved by the time I was baptized, and what I am going to try to give you is thirty five years of thinking on the problem."

A personal expression of life-long doubt in regard to our doctrines opens this combined gathering of the Adventist Forum Session, a convocation of students, meeting at Pacific Union College on the 27th of October, 1979.

1 - THE NATURE OF NEW LIGHT

Four quotations from Counsels to Writers and Editors, are then read: Pages 35:2, 31:1, 38:1, and 39:1, indicating that we should consider new light as it may be presented to us.

"If Christ is the truth, there is nothing to be lost by following the truth wherever it leads, however contrary to tradition . . . Throwing over tradition—that must remain our attitude. Christ is the truth, and we are to follow Him wherever He leads."

In this lecture we will learn that we reject "traditions" and "follow Christ" by accepting the reasonings of Dr. Ford given in this lecture in regard to his beliefs in no Sanctuary in Heaven, no Investigative Judgement, no cleansing of the Sanctuary, no Spirit of Prophecy full Inspiration, no day-year time prophecies, no 1844 events, no First Apartment Mediation,

no historic prophetic fulfillments except at Calvary and the Second Advent, no infallible Scripture, no doctrines from the Spirit of Prophecy, no two-apartment Sanctuary in Heaven, no learnings from Bible prophecies, no application of the Blood Atonement or Antitypical fulfillments of the Sanctuary Service after 31 A .D.

It is of interest to note what was quoted and what wasn't. Two or three passages were quoted without giving references, and then the four passages, indicated above, were quoted. They are all from chapter 4, entitled, "Attitude to New Light." This chapter tells us we should consider new light from God's Word. But then, going on, we discover that the next chapter, "Investigation of New Light," tells us how to examine new light, and to be careful what we accept. We are told that it will not be given to us through one or two individuals, that it should be presented to brethren of experience, and that we should especially beware of "new light" which unsettles confidence and faith in our fundamental truths—the landmarks. One might think that Dr. Ford overlooked this chapter, but not so, for he twice quoted from it, without giving references, once before and once during his quotations of the four statements from chapter 4. He had indeed given careful examination to this chapter as he prepared this lecture. (The unreferenced passages that he quoted from are found on page 47:0 line 7, and 44:2 line 6-8 of chapter 5.) But even more striking is the material presented in chapter 6 of this book, "Integrity of the Message." Here we are told that we are not to move a block or stir a pin of the Three Angels' Messages, which as you know, includes our message of the Investigative Judgment. We are told that we are on a solid, immovable platform, and that in the future, deception of every kind is to arise, and that a special point of attack will be our Sanctuary doctrine.

The new light that comes to the people of God will not contradict the light which God has already given His people (1 SM 161), and so we should be careful not to receive everything termed "new light" (CW 49, 1 SM 159). New light is never given to one solitary man (5T 291), nor to one individual contrary to the established faith of the body of believers (5T 291), and it is never given to unsettle faith in the old landmarks (5T 295). It is one of Satan's masterpieces to encourage people to imagine they have new light (2 SM 86). There are tests that should be applied to new light (GW 301), simple tests (3T 444), and you should know what to do when someone presents what is purported to be "new light" to you (CSW 32, 5T 293-294).

2 - MEN WHO LEFT THE SANCTUARY MESSAGE

"Now it was in the Twentieth Century that some of the brightest lights in the Adventist Church began to go out, over the issue of the Sanctuary. Men like Albion Ballenger—a man of undoubted integrity and spirituality . . . And about 1905, Albion Ballenger was put out of the work because of his views on Hebrews Nine. Not many years later, one of the greatest Bible teachers we've ever had in the

denomination—W.W. Fletcher . . . [who] then came to Avondale College in Australia. Everyone that knew that man thought of him as a man of God, another man of undoubted integrity."

A.L. White in his reply to this lecture by Desmond Ford ("The A.L. White Reply to D.B. Ford") tells us that Ballenger left the church after having totally denied the Sanctuary truth. I might add that he afterward tried to start a separate church organization which later collapsed. Colin and Russell Standish, veteran workers in the cause, in their study, "Origin and Development of the Australasian Controversy," relate the story of W.W. Fletcher, Bible teacher at Avondale College in Australia in the 1920's, who denied both the Sanctuary message as well as the Spirit of Prophecy itself, and then left the church. They believe, as a result of long acquaintance with him, that Desmond Ford is today teaching views similar to those of W.W. Fletcher. Both of the above tracts are part of this series and available from us.

A more extensive study on Albion Ballenger will be given later in this Reply to Desmond Ford.

3 - THE INVESTIGATIVE JUDGMENT

Illustrations of private letters, interviews, conversations, and secret committee meetings are referred to by Dr. Ford.

This lecture begins with personal doubts of the Sanctuary Service that Dr. Ford has had for 35 years. Then two notable apostasies from our church over our Sanctuary doctrine are referred to, both men being characterized to the listening students as men of "undoubted integrity" in their thinking. This is now followed by information, that cannot be verified, but if true would indicate that large segments of our denominational leaders and workers have for years personally disbelieved in our Sanctuary and Investigative Judgment message. We are told that the Australasian Division requested in the 1950's that the General Conference change "errors" in the Bible Commentary on Hebrews 9 and 10. We cannot verify this conversation by looking in the Commentary, for we were told that the errors were "removed." Two of our workers, no longer living, were supposed to have in private conversations questioned our Sanctuary message. A third, also (deceased, is said to have called a secret meeting "which kept no minutes and accomplished nothing." More secret things that we cannot check on. The reason given by Ford for these meetings is expressed in another unverifiable conversation by one of the L-committee members: "It is impossible to prove the Investigative Judgment." Not proof by Scripture, but proof by the anonymous and the dead.

"There is no Biblical way to prove the Investigative Judgment."

Dr. Ford drops the thought in the minds of our young people that one of our most important Biblical doctrines is a hoax, not at all Biblical, and totally unable to be substantiated from Scripture.

Daniel 8:14 gives the span of an important time prophecy. It is a real prophecy—Biblical, not imagined. It is interpreted using the day-year principle given in Numbers 14:34 and elsewhere in Scripture,—an additional principle that Ford rejects later in this lecture. On this day-year basis, the prophecy is 2300 years long (not 2300 days with an application to Antiochus Epiphanes IV (175-163 B.C.), as Ford suggests elsewhere).

The chapter after Daniel 8:14, Daniel 9 (25-27), was given to explain more clearly the time sequence of this prophecy of 8:14. Daniel with a lack of understanding (8:27) was given understanding (9:22) of the vision (9:23). This refers to the preceding vision, which was given him in Daniel 8, a few months prior to this additional information given him in Daniel 9.

Daniel 9:25 gives the beginning date of the 2300 year prophecy, which through comparative Scripture study yields the only Biblical decree to rebuild the city of Jerusalem and restore its political authority given in Scripture—the Decree of Artaxerxes in Ezra 7, which is the culmination of two earlier decrees to reconstruct the Temple only (that of Cyrus, 536 B.C., to rebuild the Temple with Imperial funds—Ezra 1:2-3; and that of Darius, 519 B.C., reaffirming Cyrus' decree and requiring that the Temple be finished with Provincial money—Ezra 6:3). Artaxerxes' Decree (457 B.C.) reaffirmed the completion of the Temple (7:23,20), and in addition required the full re-establishment of the civil authority of Jerusalem as chief Provincial capital of the west-Jordan Province (7:25-26,18) using Imperial funds. This date of 457 B.C. is the beginning date of the 2300 year prophecy, and is confirmed by secular history.

The first part of the 2300 year prophecy is explained in Daniel 9:25-27. 70 Weeks (490 years) would be allotted to the Jews as final probationary time as God's special people. 7 Weeks (49 years) from the beginning date brings us to 408 B.C. when the various results of Artaxerxes' Decree were completed, and the city had been entirely rebuilt (Dan 9:25). 62 Weeks (434 years) from 408 B.C. would bring us to the time of the Messiah (Dan 9:26a). His "cutting-off" would be part of a chain of circumstances that would result in the eventual destruction of the very city (9:26b) that in 457 had been ordered rebuilt. The final week (7 years) of the 70 Week conclusion of the special covenant with the Jewish race, spans from 27-34 A.D. In the middle of that 7 years (31 A.D.)—Christ's death would end the validity of the earthly sanctuary services in the eyes of God (Dan 9:27).

There still remains 1810 years (from 34 AD, to 1844 A.D.) of the original 2300 year prophetic period.

The beginning and the first part of the 2300 years is explained in Daniel 9:25-27. The event that would be initiated at the end of the 2300 years is given in Daniel 8:14. This is the restoration of the Sanctuary to its original condition of purity, and all that is involved in the doing of this. Dan 7:9-10, 13-14, 22, and 26-27 explains in greater detail what is involved in this cleansing. (We are told that Daniel 7:9,10,13, and 14 foretold the Investigative Judgment—read Great Controversy, pages 424, 426-7, and 479-481).

Inspired Scripture—whether it be Biblical or Spirit of Prophecy—is its own interpreter. Let Inspiration explain Inspiration. And the Bible elsewhere explains in detail this restoration or cleansing of the Sanctuary, why it occurs, what it involves, and what it results in. Consider the following. It is by no means a complete listing or analysis of the Biblical material available.

Leviticus 16 explains the cleansing that would come at the end of the full Sanctuary-event-cycle, that began in the spring and ended in the fall of each Jewish year. This chapter points out that there is a cleansing of the Sanctuary and of the people taking part by faith in the services that their high priest is carrying on in their behalf (Lev 16:28-34). The Day of Atonement Cleansing of the Sanctuary is well-known by the greater majority of those Biblical commentators that Dr. Ford reads with such interest. They consider it to be of major importance in our understanding of Scripture. Leviticus 16 is not something to be tossed out the back window as Desmond Ford suggests we do when we consider Daniel 8:14.

The symbolism of the restoration or setting right or cleansing of the sanctuary as revealed in Daniel 8:14 is applied elsewhere in the Bible, and generally with a "Day of Judgment" significance. Passages such as Joel 2, Malachi 3, Matthew 25, and Revelation 14, among others, can be cited. (And recall Great Controversy 426:1, and its context of 424-428, which directly links Daniel 8:14, Daniel 7:13, Malachi 3:1-3, and Matthew 25 (and Matthew 22—see GC 428:1; and Revelation 3:7-8 which is the Message to the Seventh Church—Laodicea—see GC 430:1; and Revelation 11:19—see SR 379:1-2) as descriptions of this same event of the Investigative Judgment—and—Cleansing of the Sanctuary.) In these various Biblical views of the Investigative Judgment is to be seen aspects of the pleading, mediation, investigation, judgment, and cleansing that occur within it. Biblically, we are to take an active part by faith in seeking this investigative-cleansing experience of our Lord on our behalf. Read Great Controversy 424:4-425:2, 427:1-428:2, 430:1-432:0, 485:2-491:2.

Joel 2—Gathering at the Sanctuary at the day of solemn fast, that the enemy may be removed from among the people. The priests leading out, the people pleading God's mercy. Carefully read Joel 1:14-15; 2:1-3, 10-32; 3:14-21.

Malachi 3—The coming of the Lord to His Temple to judge and purge (cleanse) His own. This is followed by an Executive Judgment against the wicked (Investigative: Malachi 3:1-4, Executive: 3:5; Investigative: 3:16-18, Executive: 4:1-3, and as a parting word—the preparation we are to make in view of these coming events, 4:4-6)—for as we all know, everyone will face one or the other of these two judgments. Great Controversy 424:3-426:0 will provide you with additional detail.

Matthew 25—Those preparing and those not preparing for this Judgment of Investigation (Matthew 25:1-30), and the separating work of this Judgment (25:31-46). (Great Controversy 426:2-428:0 and onward to 430. Also GC 428:1 on Matthew 22).

Revelation 3:7-8 (GC 430:1) reveals that in the time of the Seventh Church, the door to this special

cleansing work offered us by the True Witness is now available to us and we should avail ourselves of it. We are not to be passive observers of what is going on. We are to be active participants, as were those gathered outside the Sanctuary on the Day of Atonement, pleading and working that we and those around us may be ready for the conclusion of this great Final Day in the atoning cycle.

Revelation 14—The result of the Investigative Judgment (Revelation 14:3-5), the Call to this Judgment (14:6-7), the Warning to flee the ungodly and Babylon and return to God while probationary time remains in the Judgment (14:8 and 18:1-5, GC 390:2, 603:2). The Terrible Warning against the Beast and His Image and his Mark and the Wrath of God that will be poured out on those that refuse this final warning (14:9-11), and those who will pass this Judgment—"those who keep the commandments of God and the faith of Jesus"—truly, a righteousness by faith in verity.

Daniel 9:25-27 explains the events at the beginning of the 2300 year prophecy. Daniel 8:14 explains the span or length of the prophecy. Daniel 7:9-10, 13-14, 22, 26-27 explains the events at the end of this prophecy—and this explanation is one of an Investigative type of Judgment. The 1260 years of papal domination clearly ended in 1790 A.D. (Daniel 7:25), is followed by the Investigative Judgment (7:26) that will result in the final destruction of this Little Horn Beast Power, just as the Cleansing of the Sanctuary (which is the immediate effect or last part of this Investigative Judgment) (8:14), will result in a permanent cessation of the Little Horn efforts to trample underfoot the principles and work carried on the Sanctuary service (8:11-13).

There is a final time of judgment for all men (Eccl 3:17) that comes after men die (Heb 9:27). It is conducted by Christ (Jn 5:22, Acts 10:42) in the presence of the Father (Rom 2:16). In this investigative Judgment, Jesus is both the Judge (in 5:22) and the Advocate (1 Jn 2:1, Heb 7:25). It will occur on a day especially appointed for this purpose (Ac 17:31) and will Precede—come before—the Second Advent when Christ will dispense the rewards allocated as a result of its decisions (Matt 16:27, Rev 22:12). It will occur after the 1260 years is ended (Dan 7:25-26), and at the end of the 2300 years when the records within the Heavenly Sanctuary will be set right and restored to their original purity (Dan 8:14) for the cleansing of the Sanctuary in type is the Day of Atonement (Lev 16:19-34) which is the typical Day of Judgment in the overall sequence of Heaven's plan to save men. It is the time when the Sanctuary is "reconciled" (Lev 16:20) or restored to its originally clean condition (Lev 16:19,30), for in making an atonement for the Sanctuary and for the people of the Sanctuary (Lev 16:33) the priest is actually cleansing the Sanctuary and the people (Lev 16:30) for the very word "atonement" in Leviticus means "cleanse" (Lev 14:20, 31, 53).

This work of Investigative Judgment involves a coming of the Father to Judgment (Dan 7:22) and His seating for it (Dan 7:9), and a coming of the Son to the Father, for this same purpose (Dan 7:13)—for "the Judgment shall sit" (Dan 7:26). During the course of

it, men will be judged by their words (Ecc 12:14, Mt 12:36-37), and their secret purposes and motives (1 Cor 4:5), and by their works (Ps 62:12, Jer 17:10). All is laid out before God (Isa 65:6-7).

As a result of its decisions, Jesus will return to earth (Rev 22:12, Mt 16:27), the Beast will lose his dominion (Dan 8:13; 7:26), and will be burned with devouring flame (Dan 7:11). Christ will receive the Kingdom (Dan 7:14) and His redeemed will inherit it with Him (Dan 7:27) and everything will be placed under His feet (Dan 7:14,27). The very time is thus given us in Scripture when one of the most important events in all history will convene—the Investigative Judgment that will cleanse the records and the people of the Sanctuary of sin (Dan 8:14, Lev 16:18-34).

The Investigative Judgment is here proven from Scripture, and there are thousands in our church who can equally establish it as well or better than I. We as a people regularly do it when we give Bible studies and hold evangelistic efforts, although not generally, of course, in such detail as is given here. If Dr. Ford would go out and give some Bible studies to the lost, and pray for them and ask the Lord to lay a burden for souls on his heart, he would soon find out what we as a denominated people believe in these areas, and the solid Biblical basis on which they are established, instead of spending his energies in trying to take away from our young people the messages that we cherish as a people. He is seeking to make an issue where no issue exists. He is seeking to remove our concern and participation in the Investigative Judgment now passing in the Great Sanctuary above. In the presence of Heaven and before the recording angels, I take my stand and condemn this deadly work as proceeding from Satan. With great urgency, Dr. Ford is trying to destroy the special messages of Great Controversy from our lives, and through us, from the lives of a world dying for want of them. This is Satanic. Whether or not he knows what he is doing may be questioned. But the effect of what he is doing is clear-cut. He is bent on destroying our confidence in our message and in our work. We live in the Hour of the Final Investigative Judgment—the Hour of the Three Angels' Messages. Which will you and I choose—an Adventist Biblical and Spirit of Prophecy basis for our faith or a Ford and Brinsmead speculative basis for it? Your and my decision in this matter will be an important one, for it will decisively affect what the future will bring to us, individually.

If you would like to read further into what the Spirit of Prophecy says about the Investigative Judgment, here are some passages to consider: Great Controversy, 352, 355-6, 422, 424, 426-427, 436, 457, 479-491. Early Writings, 280, Story of Redemption, 402-403. Life Sketches 241-244. Patriarchs and Prophets, 357-358. Prophets and Kings, 716. Desire of Ages,

640. 1 Testimonies, 100, 198. 4 Testimonies, 384, 387. 5 Testimonies, 331, 526, 692. 6 Testimonies 130. 1 Bible Commentary, 1118, 7 Bible Commentary, 987. 1 Selected Messages, 125, Christ's Object Lessons, 122-3, 310, 312. Testimonies to Ministers, 446. 3 Spiritual Gifts, 37-38. Gospel Workers, 315. Ministry of Healing, 104-105. Sons and Daughters of God, 355.

4 - MEN ANONYMOUS AND DEAD VS. THE WORD OF GOD

"Today in the 1910's in every area of our ranks, from General Conference down, there are men who hold the same opinion:. This is true in all our key institutions . . [and includes] a number of Bible teachers."

The truth of the Investigative Judgment is here clearly called into question by Dr. Ford, but it is done through the statements and positions of "other people," whose names we are not given that we may verify, except for those that are dead. The Australasian Division Biblical Research Institute met in February of 1976, because many workers of long years experience were firmly convinced that Desmond Ford was teaching error to the students at Avondale where he was chairman of the Department of Religion. He defended his positions by telling of others who held the same views, rather than by giving a clear, direct and thorough Biblical study in defense of his own. A man solid in Scripture can prove his position from Scripture. You will note that throughout this entire October 27 Lecture, here under consideration, Dr. Ford gives comparatively little Scripture in defense of views which differ widely from those of our own. It is a truth upon which we can all agree that if one can firmly defend his position from the Bible and Spirit of Prophecy, he won't need statistics, and private conversations, unknown committees, excerpts from personal letters, analogies, metaphors, citations from contemporary theologians, disparagement of Biblical Inspiration and its penmen, preferential usage of certain Bible and Spirit of Prophecy passages and a total ignoring of others, denial of Spirit of Prophecy Inspiration, careful attention to little matters such as a second falling of the stars while ignoring, ridiculing or flatly denying major doctrines that have made us what we are. Careful presentation of Biblical research should be conducted in a different manner.

"From time to time I receive letters, from ministers mainly, who are embarrassed on this topic. Here's one from a man who left the ministry a little time ago. A good soul-winner, a very earnest Christian."

"In spite of my love for my church, my work, and above all, my wife, I felt myself compelled by conscience to withdraw from the ministry of the Seventh-day Adventist Church. The main reason why I finally took this traumatic and rather heart-wrenching step was because I had come to disbelieve my Church's teaching of a pre-Advent Investigative Judgment."

"The Bible and the Bible only can be believed after first bringing it into line with the so-called 'Spirit of Prophecy' in Adventism."

This reminds one of the problem they had up in heaven. There wasn't one until Lucifer came along and told everyone they had one. "You are all having problems with what you believe. I can help you solve them." This is what some have told me. And here is

what another said. Today in every area of our ranks, from the top down, there are angels who hold the same opinion. This is true among all the angels. People all over are full of doubts. I have puzzled over it for some time and I want to share my thoughts with you. I believe I have the solution to the problem you are having."

As you listen to the letters you may note a marked similarity of style and content. Letters purportedly from men who were shaken in faith, who left denominational work, who left their church—all because they were racked with doubts over the simple Biblical fact that Jesus went into the Sanctuary at His ascension to begin His mediation on our behalf, as is clearly taught in Hebrews Nine, and then entered the second apartment in 1844, as is taught elsewhere in Scripture (partially covered in the study just given above), for the Investigative Judgment and the Cleansing of the Sanctuary.

How many people have you met who are filled with doubts about the Heavenly Mediation of Jesus our Lord? None, unless Desmond Ford or one of his former students—now pastors in our churches—met them first. But here in this lecture our young people are told that there are large numbers weighed down with doubt and despair in regard to basic truths of Adventism.

All of these letters contain, without exception, the very teachings that Ford will himself seek to vindicate later in this lecture. The next five Lecture Statements that I will here quote are extracted from letters that he quotes and from his comments on them. He wouldn't be presenting them to the young people in our colleges if he did not believe these atheistic doubts himself. You may consider my language strong, but this is exactly what they are. One who will turn from the plain truths of Scripture and cavil over them and reject them is expressing atheistic sentiments, and he will one day reap the whirlwind that will come from it. Dr. Ford is taking his stand in the full blaze of light given us in this day in the Spirit of Prophecy. If he did not have access to this light he would not have the guilt in this matter that he bears.

5 - DAY-YEAR PROPHETIC INTERPRETATION

"For example, a day for a year, a Bible text often quoted, and they think we deny Scripture if we say, 'Nowhere does the Bible give a day for a year as a prophecy.' And yet this is true. See Numbers 14:34—the prophecy is for 40 years—not 40 days!"

The Bible does indeed give a year for a day in providing us with a key to an understanding of Biblical time-span prophecies. Read Ezekiel 4:5-6. That is exactly what it says. But let's start with Numbers 14:34: A number is given—forty days (Numbers 13:25, 14:34) and then we are told that it will be fulfilled in an actual span of forty years (Numbers 14:33-34). We call this a Bible Time Prophecy. This instruction is part of a direct quotation from God, found in verses 27-35. If we cannot accept what is Biblical and that

which is told us directly by our Creator Himself, what are we to believe? Another example: Ezekiel 4:5-6. A number is given—forty days. And then we are told it will be fulfilled in a prophesied time span of forty years.

Revelation 11:3 and 12:6 are parallel prophecies. Both refer to the same time span, each supplementing the information of the other in regard to it. In these two verses a number is given—1260, and an obvious time prophecy is intended. As we were instructed in Numbers 14:34 and Ezekiel 4:5-6, we may take the next step and believe that it is to be fulfilled in an actual number of 1260 years.

In summary then, a time span in days is given in Scripture and an obvious time span Bible prophecy is intended. The later or fulfillment time span is to be the same number, but in years rather than days. This is the day-year principle—a valid principle of interpreting Biblical prophecies that was given us in the Bible (Numbers 14 and Ezek 4). We didn't dream up this day-year principle outside of the Bible. We found it given us within the Bible.

For Spirit of Prophecy passages dealing with the day-year principle, read *Desire of Ages*, 233, *Great Controversy*, 324, and *Prophets and Kings*, 698.

6 - INTO THE PRESENCE OF GOD, WITHIN THE VEIL

"Jesus entered the very presence of God once for all, and to the right hand of God at the ascension. Mrs. White in Early Writings and Great Controversy puts Him outside the veil, in the outer apartment, somehow, not inside."

On the contrary, the Spirit of Prophecy is in accurate agreement with Scripture. Consider: Jesus went directly into the very presence of God at His resurrection on Sunday morning (*Desire of Ages*, 790:3 based on John 20:17), and again at His ascension, forty days later (*Desire of Ages*, 818:1 line 1, 819:3 line 4, 829:1 line 1, and 834:1-3). Within this Sanctuary in heaven Jesus ministers on our behalf "before the throne of God" (*Great Controversy*, 414:2 line 3-4). During this time He was "within the veil" in the first apartment (*Great Controversy*, 412:0 last 2 lines).

"Thither the faith of Christ's disciples followed Him as He ascended from their sight. Here their hopes centered, 'which hope we have,' said Paul, 'as an anchor of the soul, both sure and steadfast, and which entereth into that within the veil; whither the forerunner is for us entered, even Jesus, made an high priest forever.' 'Neither by the blood of goats and calves, but by His own blood He entered in once into the holy place, having obtained eternal redemption for us.' Hebrews 6:19,20; 9:12. For eighteen centuries this work continued in the first apartment of the sanctuary." *Great Controversy*, 421:1-2.

Just as it is written in Hebrews Nine, quoted above in *Great Controversy*, Jesus at His Ascension entered once into the holy presence of God (*Great Controversy*, 420:2). He didn't go into the heavenly Sanctuary twice; only once. Hebrews 9:12:

"He entered once into the holy places (Greek)." Note that in the original of this passage the word is plural— "places,"—not singular— "place"—as rendered in the English. A more complete study on this point will be given later in this paper.

The throne of God was within the First Apartment while Jesus ministered there within the first veil (Early Writings, 54:2-550). Then in 1844 the Father and the Son went into the Most Holy Place within the second veil (Early Writings, 55:1-56:1). The Bible teaches that Jesus went to Heaven at His Ascension to mediate His blood before His Father within the Heavenly Sanctuary, and this He did, as substantiated by a companion source of Inspiration, the Spirit of Prophecy.

Contrary to Dr. Ford's accusation, the Spirit of Prophecy teaches that Jesus did go directly into the presence of God within the veil— the first veil of the heavenly Sanctuary—at his Ascension, and lie remains in the presence of God, going with Him in 1844 from the First to the Second Apartment in order to complete the Atonement for mankind by initiating the final phase of it, which in the Spirit of Prophecy is divided into two parts (1) an Examination and (2) a Blotting Out, (I) an Investigation and (2) a Cleansing (Great Controversy, 421:3-422:0, 483:1-486:2).

7 - SCRIPTURE EXPLAINS SCRIPTURE

"It all started a few years ago when I rediscovered the Gospel . . . In the book of Hebrews . . . I couldn't find anything about a cleansing of the Sanctuary or an atonement at some time beyond Christ's ministry on earth. I believe Christ went into the Most Holy Place at His Ascension. He was accepted in God's presence because He had completed His ministry for our salvation in favor of mankind."

This is a subtle one. We well know that not all Bible truth is given in any one place in Scripture. The fact that the full spectrum of Biblical light on the Heavenly Mediation of Christ in the Sanctuary in Heaven and the Final Atonement on behalf of mankind is not entirely given in the book of Hebrews—is cited as a reason for not believing it! What educated foolishness! Are we to throw out the Book of Daniel because it does not explain the Seven Days of Creation? Are we to reject the historical prophecies of Revelation because they do not include the sweeping historical view of Daniel Two? Actually, it is not educated foolishness. It is diabolical foolishness. Deliberately carried on to destroy faith in our message through the projection to our youth of mystifying doubts. And error has that quality—it tends to be mystifying after you listen to it enough.

It is deeply significant that such trivial objections are used to disqualify the truth of Christ's work in the First and Second Apartments of the Heavenly Sanctuary. It reveals that Dr. Ford really does not have much in the way of better objections to present. Is this the best that can be produced against our beliefs? The

amazing part is that so many of us spend the time listening to him on cassette, attending his meetings, supporting those who teach his beliefs, and give careful attention to the monthly publications of his doctrinal twin—Robert Brinsmead.

It should also be noted that in the above objection, Dr. Ford expresses an underlying belief of his—one that only surfaces from time to time in this lecture. It is an error, advanced enough in concept, that he knows better than to make an issue of it until more time has elapsed: this is the teaching that Desmond Ford not only does not believe that Jesus began a First Apartment ministry at the time of His Ascension to Heaven. Dr Ford really does not believe that Jesus began any work of atonement—First Apartment or Second—at the time of His Ascension. Desmond Ford believes and teaches the modern Protestant view of a "finished atonement" at the cross. It was "legally—forensically—finished" at Calvary. Our sins were blotted out at that time—on paper that is. He only waits in Heaven for His Second Advent, at which time He will, in fact, take away our sins from us and take us to heaven. The Atonement and the Judgment was legally completed at the Cross. The Atonement and the Judgment are actually put into effect in our lives only at His Coming in the clouds of heaven. And just now, He is not waiting in a two-apartment sanctuary, for Ford has elsewhere spoken and written that there is no Two-Apartment Sanctuary in Heaven. He believes that all Heaven is the Sanctuary, and that there is no particular structured building there by that name, in which the Father and Son are to be found, past, present or future, carrying on—or not carrying on—a work of atonement in our behalf.

But, again, dealing directly with the above objection: Not all Bible truth is given in any one place in Scripture. The furniture of the Sanctuary is given in Exodus and Hebrews, but not in Daniel. The Cleansing of the Sanctuary (the work of the Day of Atonement) is given us in Leviticus 16 and Daniel 8:14, but not as clearly in the book of Hebrews. Hebrews tends to emphasize the beginning of Christ's work in the Heavenly Sanctuary. Paul was writing to first century Christians, giving them "milk," and hoping to begin them on stronger food soon (Hebrews 5:1 1-14). It was for this reason that he gave the parenthetical chapter of Hebrews 6. He intended to go directly from 5:10 into chapter 7, but doubts as to the comprehension level of his hearers forbade him. When we view Leviticus 16, Daniel 7 and 8, as well as related passages, such as Malachi 3, Revelation 14 and Matthew 25, we are find ourselves involved in other aspects of the overall Atonement, and some, very majestic indeed. These passages tend to clarify the final work in the heavenly sanctuary more than the book of Hebrews does.

And this is the reason why Dr. Ford keeps coming back to Hebrews: Because it appears to deal more directly with mediatorial events at the Ascension of Christ, and this is as far as Ford wants to take this subject. He would wish to wipe out a knowledge of the Daily and Yearly Ministry of Christ from our minds.

Let us ask Dr. Ford this: You deny that Jesus went into the First Apartment of the Heavenly Sanctuary at

His Ascension, and say it is unscriptural. Where in Scripture does it say He went into the Second Apartment at His Ascension? Certainly not in Hebrews. The truth of ta hagia, which you admitted in this lecture, and then later sidestepped, reveals that when Jesus ascended to heaven, He entered the Sanctuary and went into the presence of His Father. The phrase, ta hagia, does not say which apartment He went into at His Ascension.

Scripture opens before us the truth that Jesus went directly into the presence of God at His Ascension. Additional details of exactly what He did within the Sanctuary upon arriving there, and since then, are amplified in the writings of different prophets—Daniel, Moses, Joel, Malachi, Christ, Paul, John and Ellen White. We have partially covered this in the preceding part of this study and additional attention will be given to it later.

8 - SCRIPTURE DATES 1844

"As much as I would like to salvage some contemporary fulfillment, I find the Scriptures silent on 1844. Christ entered God's unveiled presence once, at His Ascension. As much as we commiserate [express sympathy] with the pioneers that October 23, Edson was deceived in the cornfield, we cannot construct a soteriological system on historical non-occurrence . . . We can't construct a doctrine on the fact that Edson had some sort of a conviction in the cornfield. There are some unthinking people who would make a joke out of the fact that it was in a cornfield."

Don't be frightened by that adjective "soteriological." It is just a big word invented by the experts to keep the rest of us from thinking for ourselves. Priestcraft has often derived power from the use of such sizable mouthfuls. And you will notice the tendency that the weaker the Biblical base for a theologian's ideas, the more he will use unknown words and little known phrases to convince men that he is correct. Soteriological just means a plan of salvation. It comes from soter, the Greek word for savior.

As one stops to consider the matter, the date 1844 is one of the most important dates in all history, for it marked a major event that will shake all history preceding it and decide all history that will follow it. Be careful how you joke about the Judgment, Desmond, before our young people.

We are told in this objection by Ford that Scripture is silent on 1844. It is with interest that we note that Scripture is silent as to the date of nearly every distinctive event in history—Biblical history or otherwise. The date of Creation, the date of the Fall, the date of the Flood, the date of the Exodus, the date of the giving of the Ten Commandments, and on through pre-first-advent history. The date of Christ's birth or any of the events connected with it, nearly every event of His earthly life, and onward through the New Testament and beyond.

Oh, you might say, some dates are so important that they are indeed given—the date that Christ began His ministry, and the date He died for the sins of the

world. Yes, you are right. These are key events in the Atonement of Christ for mankind. And where do you learn of them? In the great time prophecy of Daniel 8 and 9. Each one is an initiation date—the date that something very important in the salvation plan for mankind began. And just so, that important prophecy of Daniel 8:14 linked with 9:25-27 also gives us one more date that is just as certain as the first two—the date the Final Phase of Christ's Atonement for mankind began. Three key dates are given us in the Bible. The date Christ's Earthly Ministry began. The date Christ's Sacrificial Death in the Outer Court of earth occurred—and—His First Apartment Mediation of the Daily began. The date Christ's Second Apartment Final Atonement began—the beginning of the great Investigative Judgment of God's professed people, and the beginning of the Cleansing of its records. This third date is as momentous as the first two. For its termination will bring the end of Human Probation. How solemn! You dare not joke it away in the seat of these scoffers.

Scripture is NOT silent in regard to the date 1844! There are only four important dates concerned with our salvation that the Bible is not silent on—and 1844 is one of them. The truth is that in the area of Biblical prediction, Dr. Ford is a Futurist. He was taught it by F.F. Bruce, a modern Protestant Theologian of the Plymouth Brethren Church who strongly advocates it. It was taught to him by Bruce in 1970-1972 at Manchester University in England, and is expressed in Ford's doctoral thesis. Futurism is the teaching that all Biblical prophecies are fulfilled either (1) at Calvary or (2) immediately prior to the Second Advent—and not at any other time. Jesuits under Ribera invented this error in Spain in the year 1590, as part of their systematic "counterreformation" attack against Protestantism. Its objective is to eliminate all prophecies that point to the papacy, and among modern Protestant churches its strongest defender today is the Plymouth Brethren Church, under whose teachings Desmond Ford obtained his theological doctorate in 1972. Since that time he has begun publishing books on the prophecies of Daniel and Revelation for our people to read. Within these studies you will find little to say about the papal domination of the Little Horn Beast power. "A cross, a cross, look back to the cross"—but no messages of looking forward to the final events in the crisis depicted in Great Controversy, no Third Angel's Warning to mankind in our time. It is of interest to note how the Futurist error was introduced into Protestantism. For over three hundred years the Jesuits have sent trained agents into the various Protestant denominations for the express purpose of compromising their teachings by infiltrating them with Roman Catholic theology. And they have succeeded remarkably well. It is a well-known fact that almost nothing is today published by Protestant churches or publishing houses in their books and periodicals that is opposed to the Catholic Church. And now this teaching of Futurism that would blot out the historical fulfillments of Bible prophecy as given in the book, Great Controversy, is being introduced by clever men into our own ranks.

9 - SCRIPTURE AND HISTORICAL OCCURRENCES

The subtle insinuation is made by Ford in this objection that our pioneers considered Hiram Edson's idea a grand delusive error.—Here he is producing more of these unverifiable thinkings of deceased people in order to prove his assertions to be correct. In reality, our pioneers believed fully in the inspiration of the Bible and in what it taught. What a record Ford will have to meet in the Judgment! He even puts untruths in the mouths of dead men. These men stood solidly shoulder-to-shoulder in defense of the faith. A faith that Ford is now asking us to lay down.

The statement was made, "We cannot construct a soteriological system on historical non-occurrence." Christ's entry into the Most Holy Place in 1844 is called a "historical non-occurrence." But so could be classified by the historian nearly every major or minor event in Scripture. All are "non-occurrences"—they are not verified by secular history. The life of Abraham, Joseph in Egypt, the crossing of the Red Sea, Daniel in Babylon. Solomon's Temple, Jonah's trip to Ninevah. Christ's Sermon on the Mount, the ministry of John the Baptist, the life of Paul or the authorship of any of his epistles. As far as non-Biblical historical records go, they all would be considered as historical non-occurrences. But because we are not told about them outside of the Bible—are they therefore to be considered as untrue? More downgrading of the precious inspired Word of God; our only solace, our only pathway to the City of God. This man is not a Biblicist, he is a modernist. Dr. Ford, stop trying to confuse people and lead them away from "It is written," with your big words. You are drawing precious souls away from Jesus that you might draw them after yourself. Unless you repent and turn from this work, you will one day soon answer for it in the very Judgment that you so freely call into question!

"However high any minister may have stood in the favor of God, if he neglects to follow out the light given him of God, if he refuses to be taught as a little child, he will go into darkness and satanic delusions and will lead others in the same path."—Testimonies, volume 5, page 214:1.

"Any man who seeks to present theories which lead us from the light that has come to us on the ministration in the Heavenly Sanctuary, should not be accepted as a teacher."—Life and Teachings, page 49.

10 - GOD'S OMNISCIENCE DOES NOT DESTROY BIBLE TRUTH

"If an Investigative Judgment is necessary to determine who are prepared for the kingdom of God, how was it that Christ was able to assure the disciples beforehand that in the regeneration when the Son of man should sit in the throne of His glory, that they also would sit upon twelve thrones? How was it that Christ was able to say to the dying thief, 'You will be with Me in paradise?' The truth is, 'the Lord knoweth them that are His.'

2 Tim 2:19. 'I know My sheep,' declares the Good Shepherd, 'and am known of mine.'

The following are the four basic attributes of the Godhead: eternal, omnipotent, omnipresent, and omniscient. Belief in a Final Judgment is not a denial of the truth of God's omniscience (all-knowingness). The Godhead knows all things in time—past, present and future, and all things in space—everywhere throughout the universe at any and every instant of time. Ford would, in this objection, presume to set the Investigative Judgment against the omniscience of God, but this strained argument can be used to destroy many other Biblical truths as well.

Divinity knows from eternity past, every choice mankind would ever make, and the consequent results in the life and salvation of every creature. But it was thought best in the Divine counsels to have an Investigative Judgment as a concluding part of the great controversy, to reveal to the universe the justice underlying every aspect of salvation and damnation. God doesn't need a Day of Investigative Judgment but His creatures do.

The Sentencing Judgment, as I call it, during the Millennium is equally unneeded by Deity and equally needed by creation. The six thousand year great controversy was totally unneeded by the Father, Son and Holy Spirit to clarify in their minds the results of sin and Satan's rule, but on behalf of the interests of all the worlds it was vitally necessary. God instantly knows the outcome of the Investigative Judgment and the Sentencing Judgment from eternity past, but for our sakes it is given.

To seek to destroy the Investigative Judgment on the ground that God didn't need it is a surprisingly shallow attack on the part of one so well educated. But, unfortunately, much of it was acquired in Protestant Modernism which prefers to deny many Biblical truths. Again, it is but another evidence of how solid our position is that such weak arguments are all that can be set forth in an effort to overthrow it. And how solid it is! The truth of a coming Judgment that will sit to weigh and decide the lives of men is a basic truth of Scripture. The Bible does not teach that this great Examination was done at some past time in history, nor does it teach that it is never to be done in history at all—as Dr. Ford is here declaring to the young men and women that will one day be the workers and leaders of our church. Thorough studies on the Biblical basis of the truth of the Investigative Judgment are given elsewhere in this paper.

"Now, because this tape [of this lecture] will be used in some nefarious ways, . . . let me state my convictions, my personal convictions before I go any further: I believe in a pre-advent judgment with every man's destiny settled before the coming of Christ. I believe the day of Atonement prefigured by the work in the second apartment. I believe the Seventh-day Adventist movement was raised up in 1844 by God to do a special work and it restored the gift of prophecy in the person of Ellen G. White. These for the record are my true convictions."

As we have already seen in regard to the Investigative Judgment, and shall soon see in regard to the Spirit of Prophecy, Dr. Ford is here agreeing to something that he elsewhere denies. This is no casual observation. Elder A.L. White upon hearing this lecture, or a tape of it, came to the same conclusion.

We have here one of the primary reasons the Seventh-day Adventist Church has been buffaloeed so long by Dr. Ford. Listening to him can be a puzzling experience. A call to return to Calvary and the True Gospel, may be followed by a scathing insinuation on one of our historic doctrines. This may then lead into a brief statement that fully harmonizes with our beliefs—Biblical and Spirit of Prophecy, as is given above. Next a stinging sarcasm on a pioneer position or those naive enough to hold to it. Then a ringing appeal to accept the Righteousness of Christ "only found at Calvary."

If you speak with Dr. Ford personally and question him as to his beliefs, as I have done, you will find this to be all too true. Subtle innuendoes regarding our beliefs will be interspersed with comments of acceptance of them. Many today are totally confused as to the true position of Desmond Ford because of these switch-over statements of his.

[He refers to his exhaustive studies in various commentaries at Manchester University] on this very topic [of no Hebrews Nine First Apartment Mediation of Christ in the Heavenly Sanctuary, and no Daniel Eight Investigative Judgment or Cleansing of the Sanctuary beginning in 1844], and I felt that the conclusions reached from this study substantiated very strongly what I'd been teaching my own students for many years regarding the problems of Hebrews Nine and Daniel Eight . . . Now, I want to give you the problems:]

You mean, Dr. Ford, that we have been supporting and paying your salary so that you could for years spend your time filling the minds of our ministerial and other students on two continents—at Avondale College in Australia and at Pacific Union College in America, plus countless speaking engagements at churches, campmeetings, ministerial retreats, and graduate and undergraduate study sessions? Why has not someone put a stop to this years ago? Surely it was told them what you are teaching. And what shall we do now about the situation? Cohn and Russell Standish in their monumental study, "The Origin and History of the Australasian Controversy," tell us that the majority of ministers in the Australasian Division, now believe and teach the same errors that you do. That is the result of twenty years of your influence in Australia. And now we are nearing the completion of ten years of your ministry in North America. And they tell us that there are those in the Department of Theology at Andrews University which teach your unbiblical views, as well as the Ministry Magazine. What shall we say when men are afraid to stand up and be counted? Father, it is time for Thee to work.

11 - A BIBLE PROPHECY IS NOT INCORRECT—SIMPLY BECAUSE IT IS CONDITIONAL

"One of the main problems that faces us is certainly that of the year-day principle. Let me read from the Review and Herald—I always feel safe when I do that (laughter) [and then inferential statements are made indicating that the year-day principle of prophetic interpretation is to be called into question—simply because Jesus could have returned shortly after His Ascension.]

We have here the pitting against one another, of two correct but unrelated Biblical facts. And then an erroneous conclusion is stated. But because the logical conclusion was basically irrational, the one hearing it notes the confusion in it and tends to think that the confusion is within himself, when it is really within that which was told to him.

(1) [Scripture:] Time prophecies can be interpreted by the day-year principle. (2) [Human reasoning that might have been possible 2000 years ago, but today is irrelevant (speculation based on the truth of conditional prophecies):] It was theoretically possible for Jesus to have returned to earth soon after His ascension. (3) [Erroneous confused thinking:] Time prophecies based on the day-year principle are therefore not correct, because if Jesus had returned to earth the second time soon after His ascension, the 2300 day prophecy could not have been fulfilled in 2300 years—and therefore it can not today be interpreted as a 2300 YEAR prophecy, even though 2300 years have indeed elapsed since the prophecy went into effect.

This is the reasoning that Ford uses to disprove the 2300 Year Prophecy. By now, you probably feel that your mind is giving out on you. Not at all. The fault is with the reasoning, not with your mind. It is based on a faulty use of the Biblical principle that all prophecies are conditional. If man will, for example, turn from his wicked ways, the prophecy will not have to be fulfilled in the way originally stated. The time might be shortened, the punishment might be lessened, etc. Here are some similar examples that will reveal the underlying error in this reasoning:

Noah predicted a flood of waters would destroy everyone. But "what if" everyone had repented? Then the flood wouldn't have come. "Which proves" that the message was incorrect to begin with. The very possibility that the outcome could have been different proves that the message itself was wrong. Noah was a false prophet.

(1) God has predicted hellfire for wicked men, but (2) no one theoretically need be lost, "therefore" there is a question whether the truth of hellfire is really valid, because it was theoretically possible for it not ever to have occurred. There must not be a hellfire after all.

Is such speculative "what if it had been" and "if" reasoning to become the basis for deciding what is truth in our Church?

12 - DANIEL EIGHT FOURTEEN

"The second problem is this one: In Daniel 8:13 and 14, we have a problem of context. In Daniel 8 we read about the nasty little horn treading down the Sanctuary; the nasty little horn doing a work of transgression. And then it says, how long shall the Sanctuary be trodden underfoot by this nasty little horn. And the answer is given, 'Unto two thousand three hundred days.' But now, note, Adventists talk about the nasty little horn, doing his work on earth, and then suddenly, instead of Antichrist defiling the Sanctuary, they start talking about the saints defiling the Sanctuary with their sins, and thus needing a cleansing. Are you following me? The context of Daniel 8:14 has to do with a wicked power defiling the Sanctuary, not the sins of the saints. And Adventists in answering it, forget about the sins of the wicked power, and start talking about the sins of the saints, and they switch from earth to heaven, and they go from Daniel 8 back to Leviticus 16. This is rather thin. It ignores the contextual problem.

"The third issue has to do with the word 'cleansed.' 'Unto two thousand three hundred days, then shall the sanctuary be cleansed.' On the basis of that word, our pioneers linked this prophecy with Leviticus 16, but the word isn't there . . . Adventists have traditionally jumped from Daniel 8:14 to Leviticus 16 on the basis of the word cleansed. The point is the word cleansed isn't there, it's a mistranslation . . . but the Hebrew word isn't cleansed. . . . Now there is nothing new in bringing these objections to your attention. They have been taught for years in our Seminary. Dr. Heppenstall for many years has explained these problems and given his own answers."

The problem is not with context, as we shall see below, the problem is with Dr. Ford's Protestant commentaries. Instead of reading his Bible, he is spending his time "in nothing else, but either to tell, or to hear some new thing" (Acts 17:21) from Protestant theologians. He refuses the doctrinal inspiration of the Spirit of Prophecy, as he tells us later in this lecture, while devouring the writings of contemporary Biblical critics. Ford tries to make a tempest in a teacup out of the Little Horn in Daniel 8:9-13, while ignoring the larger context of Daniel 7 and 9. He carefully avoids mention of the extensive parallel prophecy in Daniel 7, which in timing and in events is an explanatory twin to Daniel 8:9-14.

And he makes an issue of the meaning of the word translated "cleansed" in Daniel 8:14, all the while carefully avoiding the truth that the word used in that verse in modern translations is only a synonym for "cleansed," and mean essentially the same thing as "cleansed." He is very careful not to tell us which word is used in Daniel 8:14 in place of the word "cleansed," for he knows that it will undercut his falsehood that it is something very different than that written in our King James Bibles. As a proof that Daniel 8:14 has nothing to do with Leviticus 16, he

tries to cite the fact that the word used in Daniel 8:14 is not used in Leviticus 16. The truth is that both passages say basically the same thing. Consider: In Leviticus 16, the Sanctuary is "cleansed" from sin as the final work there, that it may be restored to its original purity (Lev 16:19, 29-34). In Daniel 8:14, the Sanctuary is "restored" to its original condition, that as a result the offense of the Little Horn power may forever be destroyed (Daniel 8:9-14). Daniel Seven, in careful detail, fills in the meaning of what is involved in this restoration process told us in Daniel Eight. We are told in Daniel Seven of a work of Investigative Judgment that will result in the taking away of the dominion of the Little Horn (7:26) and giving it to the people of God (7:27) as co-heirs with Christ (7:14). As will be explained later in this paper, the key word in Daniel 8:14 is not "cleansing" (or in modern versions, "restoring" or something equivalent), but the word "Sanctuary." It is the Cleansing or Restoring of the SANCTUARY that is our link to Leviticus 16. And Biblically, this work of restoring the Sanctuary involves a cleansing of sin.

The Hebrew word used in Daniel 8:14 is the word *sadaq*, which means "to make just or right." This word is in verb form in Daniel 8:14, and is used in a form unique in the Old Testament for *sadaq*—the *niphal*. Translators and lexicographers have suggested various meanings of *sadaq* in Daniel 8:14, such as "be put right," or "be put in a rightful condition," "be righted," "be declared right," "be justified" or "vindicated." Because of its obvious reference to the Day of Atonement the Greek Septuagint Version (c. 168 B.C.) translated it as "cleansed," or *katharisthesetai*, "to make clean" or "cleanse," which is the root word used in the New Testament cleansings by Jesus of the sick.

Leviticus 16 deals with the righting of the Sanctuary from the standpoint of the putting away of sin from it. Daniel 7 unveils the Investigative Judgment that is integral to it. But Daniel 8 is concerned with the overall issue in the Great Controversy between Christ and Satan. The Investigative Judgment and the Final Atonement—the cleansing and restoration of the Sanctuary—will provide, in the records that are revealed, a clear vindication of the character of God before all the universe. The false charges of Satan against God will be shown to be groundless. God's decisions regarding who will be saved and who will be lost will justify His work in the Sanctuary, and will evoke from all men the confession, "Thy way, O God, is in the Sanctuary" (Ps 77:13), and "Just and true are Thy ways" (Rev 15:3). No longer will "the place of His Sanctuary" be "cast down" (Dan 8:11)—for God and His work in the Sanctuary will be declared right. (Dan 8:14) By the cleansing of the Sanctuary, it will be restored to its rightful place. All will say, "Thou art righteous, O Lord" (Rev 16:5), and, "True and righteous are Thy judgments" (Rev 16:7). Satan himself will be led to acknowledge God's justice (GC 670-671). The word translated "just" and "righteous" in the above passages in Revelation is *dikaio*, which is equivalent to the Hebrew word, *saddiq*, derived from *sadaq*, which is translated "shall be cleansed—made right—vindicated—exonerated—restored—put right—make right—set right" in Daniel 8:14. As a result of

the work of Investigative Judgment and Blotting Out of Sin within the Heavenly Sanctuary, the Sanctuary itself will be cleansed from the records of sin and restored to its rightful place, and the God of the Sanctuary will be vindicated in the eyes of the universe, and the people of the Sanctuary will be made right and restored to their original home, forever to live with Jesus and the angels.

"And out of one of them came forth a little horn, which waxed exceeding great . . . Yea, he magnified himself even to the Prince of the host, and by him [the little horn] the daily was taken away, and the place of His Sanctuary was cast down . . . How long shall be the vision, to give both the Sanctuary and the host to be trodden under foot? And he said unto me, Unto two thousand and three hundred days: then shall the Sanctuary be cleansed—restored." Daniel 8:9, 11, 13-14. "And he shall speak great words against the Most High, and shall wear out the saints of the Most High, . . . but the Judgment shall sit, and they shall take away his dominion, to consume and to destroy it unto the end. And the kingdom and dominion, and the greatness of the kingdom under the whole heaven shall be given to the people of the saints of the Most High, whose kingdom is an everlasting kingdom, and all dominions shall serve and obey Him." Daniel 7:25-27.

The objection as given by Dr. Ford specifically relates to two areas: **(1)** Daniel 8:14 should be viewed as a solution to the Little Horn problem and not to the people of God. **(2)** Daniel 8:14 is a restoration of the Sanctuary and not a cleansing of the Sanctuary.

In anticipation of these two points, both of them were dealt with in the rather complete study on Daniel 8:14 and its Biblical meaning, given earlier in this paper. But, in brief review, consider the following:

(1) Daniel 8:14 constitutes an investigative judgment of the professed people of God, as well as a vindication of those among them who have been faithful in their following of the Lamb. This work of judgment results in a consequent cleansing of the records of God's faithful ones,—and as indicated in the final verses of Leviticus 16, and in Malachi 3, and elsewhere, a cleansing of the people as well. (Great Controversy 424:4-425:2 speaks specifically of this. Also chapter 28 of this book.) A result of this work of judgment and cleansing is the Taking Away of the Dominion of the Beast, and his eventual destruction in flame, as shown in Daniel 7. So, Daniel 8:14 is a solution for BOTH the problem of the Little Horn, as well as the problem of the record and reality of the sin of God's people.

(2) Daniel 8:14 involves a special work in the Sanctuary. We have stated that it involves a two-fold activity—that of Examination or Judgment—and—that of Blotting Out or Cleansing. (Compare this two-fold work in G.C., 421:3-424:0; 485:2; 486:1-2.) The careful consideration of the Records of the lives of men is the Examination. This, of course, is a very Scriptural concept, many passages already having been cited. It results, or leads into, a work of Blotting Out, or Cleansing. This is spoken of in several passages of Scripture, as already mentioned. For a Bible study on the matter read the carefully prepared one

in Great Controversy, chapter 28. The overall result of this work is a Restoration or Making Right or Setting Right the records of the Heavenly Sanctuary. The Hebrew word translated "cleansing" in Daniel 8:14 can also be translated as "restoring" or "making right" or "setting right." There is no difficulty here—except to one who dislikes the message it brings him of a coming judgment. The words "cleanse" and "restore" or "clean up" or "set right" are near synonyms. They all mean essentially the same thing. If you told your son or daughter to clean up the kitchen, make it right, clean it ("to cleanse" is the same as "to clean"), set it in order, or restore it to what it looked like before it was soiled by muddy boots—your son or daughter would know exactly what you were talking about. For it all means the same thing to everyday folk who think in simple, direct ways. The Bible wouldn't seem so complicated if theologians didn't come along and try to make it complicated, to impress folk with their deep learning.

Two of Dr. Ford's primary objectives throughout this Lecture of Doubt is **(1)** to separate the Sanctuary of Daniel 8:14 from its Cleansing, and **(2)** to separate the Sanctuary of Daniel 8:14 from the Investigative Judgment which is an initial part of it.

(1) Daniel 8:14 cannot be separated from the cleansing because the key word in that verse is not "cleansing" or "2300," but "Sanctuary." If the object of this cleansing or restorative process was wagon or stone or beast, then the whole picture would be different. That which is cleansed is not "Little Horn Beast" as Ford would have us think. It is not the trampling-down power that is cleansed, it is the Sanctuary that is cleansed. And this fact immediately takes us back to Leviticus 23 and the yearly cycle of Sanctuary events to locate that part of the Sanctuary work which cleanses it, and then into Leviticus 16 for the specific work and purposes in the type of the Sanctuary cleansing on the Day of Atonement. The antitype of the outer court sacrifices is Calvary. The antitype of the throughout-the-year "daily" application or mediation of blood within the first apartment is the ministration of Christ within the Holy Place of the Heavenly Sanctuary for eighteen centuries. The antitype of the end-of-the-year "yearly" application within the Most Holy Place is the type of the final phase of the atonement—the cleansing or restoration of the Sanctuary to its rightful state,—its original condition. And Leviticus 16 clearly shows that this clearing is a sin-cleansing, which Ford would deny to Daniel 8:14. As a good Futurist, Ford wants all the sin-cleansing to be fulfilled legally at the Cross and then in fact only at the Second Advent—and nowhere else.

(2) Daniel 8:14 also cannot be separated from the Investigative Judgment. Leviticus 16, the Day of Atonement in type, was very obviously a day of judging, with a resultant "cutting off" of those not found faithful in their personal lives.

But we also have another, a second way, to link Daniel 8:14 with the Investigative Judgment. Consider this insight: Daniel 9 gives the beginning and first part of the 2300 year time span. It carries us down to A.D. 34 and then mentions a resultant event following this: the Destruction of Jerusalem in A.D. 70. Daniel 8 gives the time span length itself, and

13 - HEBREWS NINE

then provides the key to knowing what will occur at its end. Daniel 7 covers the entire span, but significantly, focuses on—details—that latter part not covered by Daniel 9. As in Daniel 8, we are told of the Little Horn rule (8:9-13 and 7:8, 20-21, 24-25), and then we are given quite a bit of information about this major event that would follow the Little Horn domination (Dan 8:14 and 7:9-10, 13-14, 22, 26-27)—the Cleansing of the Sanctuary in chapter 8 and the Investigative Judgment in chapter 7.

The Little Horn power began working within a hundred years after the Destruction of Jerusalem in A.D. 70. By A.D. 150, Pius I was calling for a Sunday Passover, instead of the lunar one given in Scripture. Shortly thereafter in Rome, Justin Martyr in 155, gave us the first written record of Sunday observance. And Paul tells us that by A.D. 51-52, the mystery of iniquity was already at work (2 Thess 2:7).

The Little Horn power is the linking key between Daniel 7 and 8. It is the outstanding concern of chapter 7 and a major concern of chapter 8. Following the period of Little Horn domination in Daniel 7—comes the Investigative Judgment. This is very obvious, for three times we are shown the transition between the two in Daniel 7 (7:8 to 9, 21 to 22, and 25 to 26). Following the period of Little Horn domination in Daniel 8—comes the Cleansing and restoration of the Sanctuary. Very clearly the transition is from Little Horn to Investigative Judgment in Daniel 7, and from Little Horn to Day of Atonement cleansing in Daniel 8.

Dr. Ford, read the Bible prophecy of Daniel 7 and 8 and take it for what it says. The Bible will tell you far more than studies into Protestant Commentaries. In both chapters there is a Divinely given switch-over from the earthly trampling of God's people and principles by the Little Horn power, to a vindication of God's people and those principles by a heavenly power—the Investigative Judgment conducted by the Son before the Father within the Heavenly Sanctuary.

The Judgment is begun, as seats are arranged and the Ancient of Days is seated (7:9,26). The Courtroom is filled with attendants and the books are opened (7:10) (Compare the picture given in Early Writings, 54-55—a picture which Dr. Ford calls "imaginary" later in this Lecture.) The Son of Man comes before Him, and is brought near to Him (7:13), and the Sanctuary is cleansed and restored (8:14) by this work of Judgment. As a result of it, the Son of man is given an eternal dominion and glory and a kingdom (7:14), and the dominion of the beast power is taken away (7:26). No longer shall the Sanctuary work be trodden under foot (8:13)—no longer shall the ministry within the Sanctuary be downgraded by men, such as Dr. Ford, who are taught in the schools of Rome and its daughters, voicing the sentiments of Rome, the Little Horn power—that there has been no extended Mediation of Christ in the great Sanctuary above on behalf of His people these many centuries. God's little children will take the kingdom (7:18,22) as co-heirs and reign with the Son forever (7:27), and the Little Horn Beast shall be slain and given to the burning flame (7:11).

"Now let us come to the real problem . . . [and then develops his conviction that Hebrews Nine does not teach that Christ went into the First Apartment, the Holy Place, at His Ascension to Heaven, but instead went into the Second Apartment, the Most Holy Place, without ever having entered into the First Apartment] [Hebrews 9:7, 12, and 24 is quoted from the King James Version, with changes by Ford ("holy place" is changed to "most holy place" in verse 12, and "holy places" is changed to "holy place" in verse 24), then 9:12, 25, 7-8, 23-24 is read from the New International Translation, which interpretively views Christ as entering directly into the Most Holy Place] "In case some folk try to make an issue out of the Greek; the word that is here translated "most holy place" is literally, "holies." The Septuagint uses it repeatedly in Leviticus 16 for Most Holy Place. The word itself can mean the Sanctuary as a whole, or it can mean the First Apartment, or it can mean the Second Apartment. You can prove nothing from the Greek because it has these possibilities.

"Let me underline it again, for you must get this point: The book of Hebrews distinctly teaches that Christ went directly into the Most Holy Place at His Ascension. There is no way out, round, or through it. I have ransacked every nook and corner, and twisted every syllable. There is no way out or round or through it. The book of Hebrews, chapter nine, teaches that Christ went directly into the Most Holy Place at His Ascension. I will repeat for you verses seven and twelve." [His own paraphrase of Hebrews 9:7,12 is then given] Every commentary in the world has seen it, my friends, except one or two by Seventh-day Adventists."

In brief, Desmond Ford is providing us here with a flat denial that Christ went into the Holy Place, or First Apartment, of the Heavenly Sanctuary at the time of His Ascension. Instead, Ford maintains that Jesus went directly into the Most Holy Place, or Second Apartment, of the Sanctuary. In saying this, he clearly denies an antitype fulfillment of the First Apartment ministration of Christ. And on probing his beliefs deeper than is revealed in this lecture, one will discover that Ford really does not believe in much of a Second Apartment fulfillment in the Heavenly Sanctuary either. As he tells us later in this lecture, and frequently elsewhere, it is his thinking that everything is fulfilled legally—on paper—at the Cross, and in fact—in actuality—at the Second Advent. This is in accordance with the Futurist interpretation of Biblical prophecy that he was taught in England at a modernist theological school where he received his doctorate in 1972.

What is actually a simple and direct study by Paul—Hebrews Nine—in the larger scope of the message of the entire book, Dr. Ford here twists with his syllables into a distorted picture that Paul never intended. Let us begin our reply to this by briefly reviewing the

message of the book, and then in greater detail, the message of Hebrews Nine:

Hebrews 1—Jesus is our God and worthy of the worship of the Universe. Hebrews 2—Jesus became a man like us, tempted like us, and suffered and died in our behalf. Hebrews 3—Jesus the Son of God is the Leader of Israel and our Leader as long as we hold fast by faith our confidence in Him. Hebrews 4—For it is by faith that we enter the promised rest. Let us therefore come boldly to Him in faith that we may receive the help we need. Hebrews 5-7—Jesus is our High Priest. Let us not back off from this great truth in doubt, but let us accept it for it is an important part of our hope and our salvation. Hebrews 8—Jesus is the Priest of the Heavenly Sanctuary, and His ministry is based on better promises and a better covenant. Hebrews 9—Jesus is now mediating in this Heavenly Sanctuary on our behalf! Jesus has given a better sacrifice, one that was only made once, that provided better blood, and that was taken once into the Heavenly Sanctuary. Hebrews 10—Jesus gave a sacrifice of obedience, that can take away our sin. Let us come to Him in faith that He may forgive and remove them, and then let us patiently follow in His example of obedience. Hebrews 11—Faith in Jesus is the enabling key. Consider these examples of others who by faith held firm to the end. Hebrews 12—Press onward by faith and do not doubt because of the difficulties you encounter, for by them God is preparing you for heaven. Hebrews 13—In closing, here are some practical pointers to help you in daily living.

Before giving a detailed view of Hebrews Nine, we need to understand the basis of Dr. Ford's whole argument that Jesus went directly into the Most Holy Place when He ascended to Heaven. It is Ford's use of a single phrase occurring in the original Greek, a phrase that is to be found in nine passages in the book of Hebrews, and five of these eight are in Hebrews Nine. This is the phrase *ta hagia*, which means "the holy places." The Sanctuary was composed of two distinct apartments with two distinct services—the daily and the yearly. In conscious awareness of this two-fold work in the Sanctuary, Paul in Hebrews calls the Sanctuary *ta hagia*, the "holy places." This is the only word used in the Book of Hebrews for "Sanctuary." Paul, in Hebrews, uses *ta hagia* for the Sanctuary—the Earthly or the Heavenly. He never uses *ieron* or *vaos* which are used elsewhere in the New Testament for sanctuary or temple. And elsewhere in the New Testament, outside of Hebrews, the phrase *ta hagia* is never found, only *ieron* or *vaos*. Here are the nine places in Hebrews where *ta hagia* is used:

(1) Hebrews 8:2—translated "the sanctuary" in the K.J.V. In Hebrews 8:1-2, Paul introduces the fact that Jesus ministers as our high priest in the "true tabernacle"—the Sanctuary in heaven. This "Sanctuary" is the Great Pattern that Moses was told to make a replica of, for the Earthly Sanctuary (8:5). *Ta hagia* is quite obviously not "most holy place" in Hebrews 8:2.

(2) Hebrews 9:1—"a sanctuary" in the K.J.V. In this one instance *ta hagia* is given in the singular: "hagion." As verses 2-5 will show, Paul is speaking in 9:1 of the Earthly Sanctuary—literally, in the Greek, "the Holy Place of this world."

(3) Hebrews 9:2—"The Sanctuary." Comparing verse 2 with verses 3-5, we discover that Paul here uses *ta hagia* for the "First Apartment." And in verse 3, we learn something very significant, for Paul here gives us the Greek word that he would use in the book of Hebrews for the "Most Holy Place." it is "*hagia hagion*"—which literally means "holy of holies" (singular holy place of the plural holy places), and is translated as "the holiest of all" in 9:3 in the K.J.V. This is an invaluable help, for if Paul had wanted to use "Most Holy Place" in 9:8, 12, 24, and 25, as Ford says that he does, Paul would have used the word "*hagia hagion*" in those verses, but he did not do so. This is important, for Ford's entire argument in Hebrews Nine is based on the supposition that 9:8, 12, 24, and 25 mean "Most Holy Place." You might wonder why in 9:2 Paul called the First Apartment the tabernacle ("*sanctuary*" in the Greek of 9:2—*ta hagia*), and in 9:3 he called the Second Apartment the holiest of all ("holy of holies" in the Greek of that verse), but it is not unusual, for Moses followed similar patterns of expression in various places in his writings.

(4) Hebrews 9:8—"The holiest of all." This is the first of the four controverted verses—the four verses that Ford says means "Most Holy Place."—9:8, 12, 24, and 25. In Hebrews, chapters 5 to 7, Paul reveals Jesus as our High Priest. In 8:1-5, we are shown that Jesus is the High Priest of the Heavenly Sanctuary. And now, in Hebrews Nine this line of truth is carried further. In 9:1 we are reminded that there was an earthly sanctuary. In 9:2-5 its two apartments and their contents are described to us. In 9:6-7, we are told of the two-fold ministry in the earthly sanctuary—the Daily service in the First Apartment, and the Yearly service within the Second. Then, in 9:8, Paul is ready for the next step: to show us that this two-fold earthly service symbolized Christ's work in the Heavenly Sanctuary—a work that would begin when the earthly services no longer had meaning in the eyes of God. So then, Heb 9:6-8, taken together emphasize a two-apartment work in the Heavenly Sanctuary. That which was done in the two apartments on earth is to be done in the two apartments in heaven. That is what Paul is here telling us. It is as simple as that. Ford would deny this and say that Jesus skipped the First Apartment work in the Heavenly Sanctuary, thus making a mockery of the antitype fulfillment of the Daily, and thus making 9:1-7 meaningless—for these verses distinctly point to it as the symbol or type of the first part of the Heavenly Mediation of Christ on our behalf. But for a moment, let us take Ford at his word: What if 9:8 does mean "holy of holies"—Then why didn't Paul use *hagia hagion* in 9:8 as he did in verse 3? If he meant "holy of holies," he would have used "holy of holies." Instead he used *ta hagia* which we have seen consistently means "Sanctuary," with the only exception to this being in 9:2 where it means "First Apartment" (to contrast with *hagia hagion* for "Most Holy Place" in 9:3). So then, from the context of the verses preceding it, 9:8 means "Sanctuary." And from the usage of the Greek, *ta hagia*, it means "Sanctuary" or possibly "First Apartment." No matter how Ford may twist syllables, 9:8 means "Sanctuary," or possibly "First Apartment." It does not mean "Second

Apartment,"—and there is no way out or round or through it.

(5) Hebrews 9:12—"The holy place" in the K.J.V. 9:8-10 dealt with the fact that the Earthly Sanctuary was only a type, symbol or figure, of the one in Heaven. The mediatorial work of priests in the two apartments on earth represented the Mediatorial Work of Christ in the two Apartments of the Heavenly Sanctuary. 9:11-12 tell us that Christ having become the High Priest of this Heavenly Sanctuary, He has entered it not with the blood of animals, but with His own blood,—which is securing (present tense in the Greek, not past) through the combined result of His Sacrifice and Mediation, an eternal redemption for us! As we have already seen, "the holy place" can mean "the Sanctuary," or it can mean "the First Apartment" of that Sanctuary. Either would be correct Biblically in accordance with the fulfillment of the types, and also in agreement with the Spirit of Prophecy. The phrase here is, again, ta hagia. Recall that in 9:2 it refers to the "first apartment" and is there contrasted as different than the hagian hagia—"holy of holies," (Second Apartment) in 9:3. But I here suggest that the context of 9:12 indicates "Sanctuary" and not "First Apartment." Paul has a special point that he makes an issue of in Hebrews Nine, which he uses as but another way of showing that Christ's priestly mediation is "better" than that of the earthly—the fact that He only has to enter the Heavenly Sanctuary ONCE, whereas the Aaronic priests had to enter the earthly sanctuary repeatedly. This point is brought out in Hebrews 7:27; 9:7, 12, 25-28; 10:2, 10. He died once for our sins, and He entered the Sanctuary once, there to Mediate on our behalf. He entered once into the Sanctuary, and there within it He would carry on all the work that He would do within it—in the First Apartment and in the Second. On earth they had many enterings for the work of the Daily in the First Apartment, and, again, another entering into the Earthly Sanctuary for the Yearly Service. But in the Antitype it would not be so. ONE entering into the Sanctuary by the One designated to perform the work within it, and then once inside, He would do all the work that was to be done within it before He would again come out.

(6) Hebrews 9:24—"holy places" in the K.J.V. Going on in Hebrews Nine, Paul tells us that it is the blood of Christ that cleanses us, not the blood of animals (9:14),—and this blood could only be provided through death—Christ's death (9:15-7). And more, this blood would dedicate both people and the Sanctuary (9:19-21), make possible the remission of sin (9:22) and, ultimately, its purification from the Heavenly Sanctuary (9:23). And now, we come to 9:24, which again brings home

with startling clarity the truth that Christ has entered the Sanctuary—not the earthly, the one made with hands—but the heavenly.—For He has gone into Heaven itself on our behalf to appear in the very presence of our Holy Father. Ford would here say that this should be translated "Most Holy Place." and not "Sanctuary." But he certainly has no Biblical basis within the book of Hebrews for so doing. Ta hagia means the "holy places"—the "Sanctuary of two apartments." This is all we learn in the book of Hebrews,

for the regular usage of this word. And ta hagia is not used outside of Hebrews, anywhere in the New Testament. Ford will tell us that ta hagia is translated some other way in the Septuagint, a translation of the Old Testament made by Egyptian Jews around the year 198 B.C. But he doesn't mention that great changes occurred in written Greek between the time of Classical Greek .350 B.C. and earlier) and the time of the Koine Greek—the Greek of the New Testament and the First Century A.D. Roman world. Let us use the Greek of Hebrews to explain Hebrews, not the Greek of 200 B.C. down in Egypt. The fact stands that the burden of proof is clearly on Dr. Ford. Hebrews Nine consistently speaks about Jesus entry into His Heavenly Sanctuary Mediation. This is the great concern of the chapter, as well as of the entire book. And what Jesus enters is the ta hagia—the "holy places"—the Sanctuary (Heb 9:1, 8, 12, 24, 25), not the hagia hagian—the holy of holies**—the Most Holy Place (Heb 9:3). It is not wise to read into Scripture that which is not there. And a direct Ascension Entrance into the Most Holy Place is not there.

(7) Hebrews 9:25—"holy place" in the K.J.V. This verse was mentioned above. The two remaining usages of ta hagia are to be found in Hebrews 10:19 and 13:11.

(8) Hebrews 10:19—"the holiest" in the K.J.V. The people of God in past ages could come to Jesus just as they were, that He might remove their sins and transfer them to the records of the Sanctuary above. Through the mediation of His blood the people of God may have remission of sins,—and no further sacrificial shedding of blood is necessary (10:18). Jesus gave an offering of obedience (10:5-20), to which the earthly blood sacrifices were far inferior (10:14). We must submit to His Sacrifice, and in confidence, we must patiently continue in faith all the way to the end, willingly suffering for His sake (10:32-39).

(9) Hebrews 13:11—"the Sanctuary" in the K.J.V. This is the last of the occurrences of ta hagia in the book of Hebrews, and in the New Testament as well. The blood of certain sacrifices was taken into the ta hagia, the Sanctuary, and the animal itself was burned without the camp. The offerings in which the sacrificial animal itself was burned without the camp, occurred in both the Daily and in the Yearly. Here are the offerings that this would include: The consecration offering for the priest (Ex 29:14, Lev 8:17), certain sin offerings (Lev 4:12, 21:9:11), and one of the burnt offerings (Lev 6:11). Sin and burnt offerings were made on the Day of Atonement (Lev 16:3,5,6,9, 11). The blood taken into the Most Holy Place on this day was that of the bullock for the sins of the priest and "the Lord's goat" for the sins of the people (Lev 16:9, 11, 13-15). In both cases, their bodies were taken "without the camp" and burned (Lev 16:27-28). On the Day of Atonement the blood of these animals was taken into both the First and Second Apartments of the Sanctuary. On the basis of previous usage of ta hagia, it would appear that "Sanctuary" would be the best term here in Hebrews 13:11, rather than "First Apartment." Hagia hagian is not used here, so the Second Apartment, alone, could not be meant here. Hebrews 13:11 is metaphorical, and is telling us not to come to an earthly sanctuary, but to go rather

"without the camp" to Jesus that we may there suffer with Him. It is not, in this sense, speaking about the Entrance or Mediation of Christ within the Heavenly Sanctuary.

Ta hagia is the key to Hebrews Nine. Dr. Ford, realizing this, in his lecture told us that the word could mean more than one thing, and therefore meant nothing. This is not true, as we have seen. We have seen that ta hagia means "Sanctuary," with one exception (9:2), where it means the "First Apartment." And that one exception, contrasted by Paul with 9:3, as he does clearly shows that ta hagia is not Paul's word for "Most Holy Place." Let me say it again—the meaning of ta hagia is the key to an understanding of Hebrews Nine—and specifically, WHERE Christ went when He ascended to Heaven.

In closing, let me share with you a personal belief of many years. Dr. Ford shares many opinions in his lecture, and so I will share one: I believe God purposely guided Paul to use ta hagia—"holy places" (two-apartment Sanctuary) so that the messages of these chapters would be personally true for you and me and all of God's people,—no matter on which side of 1844 we might live. We today "while it is today" (3:7, 13, 15; 4:7) are to come to Jesus just as we are that we might receive the needed blessing (4:14-16). For He is within the "holy places" awaiting us, ready to receive and plead for us (7:25). Before 1844 you or I could come to Him in the First Apartment, after that date, in the Second. But either way, we may come to Him within "the holy places" where He awaits our arrival and where He ministers on our behalf. I believe that the entire book of Hebrews was written for those needing help in past ages. And I believe it is equally written for us who need help today in this Hour of Judgment. For us it has an added significance. In a special sense is this true of Hebrews Ten. This chapter was precious to the children of God in past centuries, and today it invites us to a special experience we may have as we come to Jesus within the Most Holy Place. Compare it with Great Controversy, chapters 24 and 28.

"From the context it is obvious. It's speaking about a place the high priest alone went once every year with the blood of bulls and goats. [Heb 9:12 paraphrased] —that's bull calves that was offered on the Day of Atonement."

"With the blood of bulls and goats." Ford tells us in this lecture, that this mention of bull and goat blood in 9:12 proves that Christ immediately entered the Most Holy Place when He ascended to Heaven—because bull and goat blood was used in the Day of Atonement Service in Leviticus 16. (Lev 16:6,9) Here, again, we have the result of a limited degree of Biblical study. Turning to the precious Word of God, we find that a young bullock was sacrificed in Leviticus 16:6, and the reason given is that it was a sin offering for the high priest; himself. This sacrifice of a bullock on behalf of the sins of the priest, along with a ram of consecration (bull and goat blood) was regularly done at the time that each priest was initially consecrated to the priesthood (Lev 8:14,22), and then as he began his work, the very frequent offering of bull and goat blood began (Lev 9:2)—the bullock as a sin offering

for himself, and a ram for a burnt offering for the people. Following this, in 9:3, the people were to bring their offerings,—a bull, a goat and a lamb. In 9:4, a bull and a ram for a peace offering, and so on. But the classical offering was the bullock and the goat. This is because this constituted the basic two-fold Sin Offering presented to God. The Sin Offerings are explained to us in Leviticus 4. Here we learn that the sacrifice presented by the priest for his own sin was the bullock (4:3-12). This was important, for if he were to go into the Sanctuary without having his sin covered by the blood of this sin offering, he would die (Lev 16:2-3). Bullock blood was shed on the Day of Atonement for the same reason that it was shed the rest of the year—that the priest might enter the Sanctuary to the Golden Altar that stood before the Lord, or on the Day of Atonement, all the way in to the Mercy Seat before the Lord. The preferred Individual Sin Offering throughout the year was a goat. And on the Day of Atonement the two animals offered were for Sin Offerings—a bullock for the priest and a goat for the people. (This was in addition to a ram for a burnt offering.) (Lev 16:3-II. 14-16).

"Neither by the blood of bulls and of goats, but by His own blood He entered in once into the Sanctuary." (Heb 9:12) We are here, in Hebrews 9:12, speaking of the dedication of Jesus to His work within the Sanctuary. When the priest on earth was dedicated to this work of the Sanctuary (Lev 8:14, 22) and began this work (Lev 9:2), he took in with him the blood of bulls and of goats. And, then, following this, he took in the sacrifices for the people (Lev 9:3-4, etc.). When Jesus entered upon His work in the Heavenly Sanctuary, He took not in with Him the blood of bulls and of goats, but His own most precious blood which alone can take away sin (Heb 9:12-12; 10:4).

14 - THE TWO VEILS

"Now in chapter six [of Hebrews], and verse 19, we have a very important expression used, "within the veil," which casts light on this topic [a paraphrase of Hebrews 6:19-20 is quoted]. Hebrews 5:19-20 clearly says that Jesus went within the veil. This expression is only used in the Old Testament for going into the second apartment. The only exception is Numbers 18:7."

Hebrews 6:19-20 tells us that our hope is to enter "into that within the veil, whither the Forerunner is for us entered, even Jesus." Dr. Ford says that this mention in 6:19 of Jesus entering "within the veil" shows that He went into the Most Holy Place in 31 A.D. In the Earthly Sanctuary, there were two coverings, one at the entering in to the First Apartment (Ex 26:36; 36:37), and the other at the entering in to the Second Apartment (Ex 26:31-33, 35; 36:35). In the King James Version these two veils are given different names. The one at the First Apartment entrance was translated as "hanging." The one at the Second Apartment entrance was translated as "veil." Then, in the New Testament, the King James translators used "veil" in every case. Obviously, this pattern of King James translation can not be used to identify the "veil" of Hebrews 6:19. We are told about the First

Apartment veil ("hanging") eleven times, and about the Second Apartment veil ("veil") twenty four times in the Old Testament. In the New Testament, the "veil" is only mentioned six times. The first three are in the Gospels and refer to the rending of the veil at the death of Christ (Matt 27:51, Mk 15:38, Lk 23:45), and the remaining three are found in the book of Hebrews. The first of these is the veil of Hebrews 6:19, which we are trying to better understand, "which entereth that within the veil." The third one is similar: "through the veil, that is to say, His flesh." (Heb 10:20).

And then we find the key in the second: Hebrews 9, verse 3: "And after that the SECOND veil, the tabernacle which is called the Holiest of all." As we have learned earlier, Heb 9:3 is clearly identified as to location, from the Greek word *hagia* hagian found within this verse, which means, literally, "holy of holies." Now we find what Paul meant when he said the term, "veil" in the book of Hebrews. —He clearly recognized—and pointed out in 9:3—that there were two veils, not one. There were two veils in the Old Testament Sanctuary (even though the King James translators called only one of the two a "veil."), and Paul recognizes and states it, so that we too shall clearly know it. There were two veils—the First Veil—at the entering in to the First Apartment, and a "Second Veil"—at the entering in to the *hagia* hagian in 9:3—the "holy of holies" or Second Apartment. (Compare: First or Outer Veil: Ed. 36, EW 251, GC 412, 420-421, PP 347, 349—and—the Second or Inner Veil: 5 BC 1109, EW 52-53, GC 414, 418-419, MH 437, PP 347-349, 353-355, 4 SG-a 8-9, SR 154-155, 226, 8 T 284.) When the priest passed through the First Veil, he went "within it." into the First Apartment. When he passed through the Second veil, he went "within it," into the Second Apartment.

So through what veil did Jesus enter, when He went into the Heavenly Sanctuary at His Ascension? He went through the veil as our Forerunner. He went into the First Apartment, as we have seen in our study of Hebrews Nine. He went within the veil. Why did He go within the First Veil? In order to perform the mediatorial work of the Daily for eighteen centuries on our behalf. As we have earlier seen, the Investigative Judgment of Daniel 7, the Setting Right of the Sanctuary of Daniel 8, and the Cleansing of the Sanctuary from sin in Leviticus 16 was not to begin until the completion of that Master Prophecy of Biblical record—the 2300 Years of Daniel 8:14. So, at 31 A.D., as predicted in Daniel 9, Jesus was to die for the people (9:26) and that death would end the sacrifices and oblations in the Earthly Sanctuary. No longer was the earthly ministry to have meaning in the eyes of God—for the Sacrifice of Christ having been completed, He would now begin His Heavenly Ministry in behalf of His people in the antitypical Sanctuary. The ending of the earthly mediation meant the beginning of the Heavenly. And this work, as predicted to the year, in Daniel 9:26-27 would continue till the Yearly began—the cleansing and restoration of the Sanctuary—in 1844 A.D., as predicted to the year, in Daniel 8:14.

The people of God have been given—as a result of careful Biblical study, under the guidance of the Gift

of Prophecy—a complete view of the antitypical Sanctuary work, from start to finish. May we never leave it to unite with the limited and meager thinking of Ford and Brinsmead and Paxton and their contemporary Protestant associates—of a "finished atonement" at the Cross. On the basis of all this, we can know that Hebrews 6:19 refers to the Entrance of Jesus within the First Veil at His Ascension to Heaven in 31 A.D. He has gone there as our Forerunner, and by faith we are to follow Him in His Mediation within the Sanctuary on our behalf. But, do remember, the word used in 6:19 was carefully selected—"veil," not "first veil" or "second veil." This was done under the guidance of the Holy Spirit, that we today may obtain as deep an experience from that verse as did the followers of Christ in centuries past. The Forerunner entered "within the veil"—the First Veil at His Ascension. And today, by faith, we may read that verse and follow our Great High Priest "within the veil"—all the way into the Most Holy Place. Thank God for His wondrous Gift—Jesus Christ our Lord, our Priest, and our God! And in the same way, in Hebrews 10:20, we today, may come to Jesus "through the veil"—that is to say His flesh—into the Most Holy Place, just as for hundreds of years past, others could come to Him "through the veil" of His flesh—into the First Apartment.

15 - TRANSLATIONS OF TA HAGIA

"Let's take the New International Translation, I'll read to you from there [9:12, 25. 7-8, 23-24 quoted]. Please note it very well indeed, because later on some of you will say, 'But,—the Spirit of Prophecy says,' and . . . even before that [before you know what the Spirit of Prophecy says,—all that the Bible says. That's the place to start!]"

The impression is given in this lecture that all modern commentaries and Bible translations support Dr. Ford's theory of "most holy place" readings in Hebrews—"except one or two by Seventh-day Adventists." This is not correct. We can agree that Bible commentators and Bible translators will generally be similar in their thinking. And if it be that the Remnant Church alone recognizes the truth of *ta hagia* as meaning "Sanctuary" rather than "Most Holy Place" in those nine passages in Hebrews, then we are willing to stand alone. But in reality, as we have found, modern translators stay with the meaning of *ta hagia*—plural holy places (or holy building of more than one room)—rather than with Dr. Ford's theological imagination. Apparently, his carefully selected "New International Translation" is one of the only ones that will substitute Modern Protestant Theology in place of textual accuracy in translation. Dr. Ford cherishes this translation as one of the only New Testament translations in which he can find consistent support for his "Most Holy Place" theory in Hebrews Nine.

A very scholarly work was recently published in this field. It is known as The New Testament from 26 Translations (Zondervan Publishing House, Grand Rapids). The objective of this volume is to bring to-

gether the whole spectrum of possible translations on every passage, along with a balance in favor of the thinking of the majority of the translators. And this objective has been admirably fulfilled in this work. Here are the nine ta hagia passages in Hebrews, as given in this book. Nothing is omitted from what is given in this book for each usage of ta hagia in these nine passages.

(1) Hebrews 8:2—"the sanctuary" in K.J.V. "holy places"—ABUV. "the Holy place"—Rhm. "the real sanctuary"—NEB. "that sanctuary"—Wms. "things holy"—Ber. "the sanctuary"—TCNT. Ta hagia means "sanctuary" in 8:2, and nothing else. (2) Hebrews 9:1—"a sanctuary" in K.J.V. "its sanctuary, a sanctuary of this world"—ASV. "its sanctuary—a sanctuary belonging to this material world"—Wey. "its holy place was in this world"—Con. "the earthly holy place"—Beck. a mundane sanctuary"—Mof. "its Sanctuary—though only a material one"—TCNT. "even the holy ritual well arranged"—Rhm. "a sanctuary that was fully equipped"—Gspd. Ta hagia means "sanctuary" in Hebrews 9:1, and not "most holy place". (3) Hebrews 9:2—"the sanctuary" in K.J.V. [this is the passage, which in context of 9:1-3, which is clearly "first apartment" for ta hagia] "a tent was prepared, the first"—Rhm. "the tabernacle was established, the first one"—Alf. "a tabernacle was made (in two portions): the first"—Con. "a Tabernacle was constructed, with an outer part"—TCNT. "a sacred tent was constructed—the outer one"—Wey. "A tent was erected: in the outer compartment"—Phi. "a tabernacle was set up. In the first part"—Beck. "for the first tabernacle was thus finished"—Ber. Ta hagia means "first apartment" in Hebrews 9:2. (4) Hebrews 9:8—"the holiest of all" in the K.J.V. [this one of the nine passages has the most translators in favor of "most holy place"—but it is only three out of six] "the Holiest"—Mon. "the Sanctuary"—TCNT. "the true Holy Place"—Wey. "the Holy of Holies"—Nor. "the real sanctuary"—Wms. "the Holiest Presence"—Mof. [Here is the context of 9:8: [A] First, a description of the first and then the second apartment of the earthly sanctuary (9:1-5). [B] The entering into the first and then the second apartment of the earthly (9:6-7). [C] Then, in 9:8, Paul talks about the entering-in to the "holy places" (ta hagia) of the heavenly sanctuary. The comparison in 9:8 is between the earthly and the heavenly "holy places."—and when Jesus entered the heavenly "holy places"]

(5) Hebrews 9:12—"holy place" in the K.J.V. "the holy places"—ABUV. "the Holy Place"—Con. "the Sanctuary"—TCNT. "the real sanctuary"—Wms. "the (Holy of) Holies (of heaven)"—Amp. The majority recognize this important verse of Dr. Ford's as referring to the "sanctuary, not to the 'most holy place.'" (6) Hebrews 9:24—"holy places" in the K.J.V. "a Holy place"—Rhm. "holy places"—Alf. No translation of "most holy place" here. (7) Hebrews 9:25—"holy place" in the K.J.V. "the holy places"—ABUV. "the (Holy of) Holies"—Amp. "the sanctuary"—Ber. "the Holy Place"—Wey. The only exception here, the Amplified, suggests "Holy of" as a possibility. (8) Hebrews 10:19—"The holiest" in the K.J.V. "the holy places"—ABUV. "the Holiest"—Mon. "the sanctuary"—Gspd. "the Holy place"—Rhm. Here again, the greater majority of these modern translators agree with the Adventist position on ta hagia—

and where Christ went when He ascended to Heaven. (9) Hebrews 13:11 "The sanctuary" in the K.J.V. "the holy places"—ABUV. "the Holiest"—Ber. "the Holy Place"—Wey. A continuous pattern of agreement with our historic position—by the majority of the modern translators cited in this research source book—can here be seen.

It might be noted here that Dr. Ford in quoting Hebrews 6:19, actually misquotes it, as he frequently does elsewhere, reading in "Most Holy Place" when neither the verse itself, nor the Greek, nor its context warrants such a paraphrase. There is no "Inner Sanctuary" in the English or the Greek of 6:19-20. This passage only says that Jesus entered the veil into the sanctuary on our behalf,—to which we can heartily agree. (Read Great Controversy, 421:1-2, in order to see how the Spirit of Prophecy applies Hebrews 6:19-20 and 9:12.)

In addition to Biblical material, we are told about the First and Second Veils of the Heavenly Sanctuary in the following passages: The First Veil: EW 251, GC 420-1. The Second Veil: EW 32, 42, 55, 72, 251-2, 274. GC 415, LS 100, PP 356.

16 - TAKING AWAY THE DAILY

"The once-a-year entrance. That was the Most Holy Place. He [the high priest] supervised things in the first apartment, but he had no distinctive work there. The distinctive work of the High Priest was this, the cleansing of the sanctuary, the day of atonement."

How long are we to put up with this kind of instruction of our youth, church members, and ministers, by Ford, Brinsmead, and Paxton? Each one of God's people has a responsibility to personally study the Bible and the Spirit of Prophecy for himself, and to know what he believes, and to refuse to accept error—from whatever source it might originate. The Spirit of Prophecy tells us that for eighteen centuries Christ ministered in the First Apartment of the Heavenly Sanctuary (GC 421:2) and we have seen that the Bible fully supports this view. But Desmond Ford says, No,—because it wasn't His job. Then whose job was it? It was beneath Him. The work of our Redemption was beneath Christ? He was supposed to assign it to someone else. Who would that be? This is scholarly foolishness. We are told in Inspired Scripture that Christ ministered for Eighteen Centuries in the First Apartment—GC 420-421, 428-430, 7 BC 913, EW 42-43, 250-251, 253-254, 274—but Desmond Ford says, No.

And this points up another fallacy in Ford's thinking: In his theory there is no room for an Antitype Fulfillment of the First Apartment Service—the work of the Daily. It got left out. Let us view the disorder of Fordian theology: Jesus underwent the Antitype of the Outer Court Experience on Calvary when His blood was shed (and only this far can we agree). But it was never taken into the First Apartment. And the Daily Ministry there on behalf of faithful believers never occurred. Instead, He is supposed to have "finished" the Atonement on Calvary, and immediately applied it following His Ascension in the Most Holy

Place. The yearly round of Antitypical Service was "finished" in the Outer Court. The Atonement, as Ford and Brinsmead view it, was not finished by the blood application in the Most Holy Place. It was finished on earth. He need only wait a score of centuries to return for His people at His Second Advent, remove their sins, and take them to heaven.

Ellen White tells us that "sacrifice" in Daniel 8:11, 12, and 13 is a supplied word and is incorrect (EW 74:2-75:0). It can be "daily mediation" instead of "daily sacrifice." Christ was once, not repeatedly, offered as a Sacrifice on Calvary. That which the Little Horn power tried to take away was not an Antitypical Daily (or continual) Sacrifice of Christ, but rather the Daily (continual) Mediation of Christ on behalf of His people in the Great Sanctuary Above. For Eighteen Centuries Christ ministered in the First Apartment as our mediating High Priest, and during much of that time the Roman Catholic Church, under the direction of Satan, tried to counterfeit His work, and even to do away with it. The Man of Sin tried to take away the "Daily"—the Daily Mediation of Christ to forgive and empower His own to obey Him—from the minds of the people (Dan 8:11-13). Satan was directly behind this work, and in truth the effort "to take away the Daily" was a hallmark of his activity for over a thousand years. And Satan is behind the present effort of Protestant theologians, and Brinsmead, and Paxton, and Ford, to take away the Daily Mediation of Christ from the minds of the people today—at a time when the Daily was never more needed.

Christ pled for His people. This is the work of the Daily. Christ mediated His blood for His people. This is the work of the Daily. Christ receives His people's prayers, mingles them with the incense of His Righteousness and then presents them to the Father as His own. And then, from the Daily Mediation, He sends to His people the strength and grace needed to overcome sin and keep His Father's Law. (And understand that the essential aspects of the Daily Mediation continued after 1844. Christ still mediates strength and grace today to all who will come to Him, in addition to carrying on His work in the Judgment.)

Ford's teaching destroys the Daily and places Christ, immediately upon His Ascension, without a First Apartment Daily, and past a completed Second Apartment Yearly. For the Second Apartment Experience is completed in our lives, and grace is past, and probation is closed, when the blood is placed on the Mercy Seat,—and Ford says that the blood was applied to the Mercy Seat in 31 AD!

In reality, Christ began the Daily shortly after His Ascension (Pentecost and the outpouring of His Spirit upon the disciples marked its beginning,—the beginning of His priestly work,—according to Acts of the Apostles, pages 38:3-39:0). It continued for Eighteen Centuries, and then in 1844, the work in the Second Apartment began. But at that time, in a very real sense, the Daily did not cease, and here is why: In 1844 Christ began the Act of Judgment within the Most Holy Place, before the Presence of the Father. But it was not a shut door. Grace continued. One door had been closed but another had been opened. The work of the Daily continued. Carefully read Great Controversy, pages 428:3 to 431:0. We may continue

to come to the throne of grace and find mercy and help in time of need. But looming just ahead is the culmination of the Yearly, when as on the day of atonement anciently, sin was put away and God's people were clean. Involved here is a personal, an individual work of preparation.

The Judgment is soon to pass to the Living. The Loud Cry—a final call to the world to put away sin and come to that Judgment—is soon to begin,—and you and I must prepare. For shortly thereafter probationary time will forever close. May God help us to be ready. And may we never deny any aspect of the Sanctuary Ministration of our Lord and Saviour Jesus Christ.

Desmond Ford would allow us to keep the Death of our Lord, while taking away His Living Intercession on our behalf. But how very important is this Intercession of Christ for each one of us! (GC 484, SC 89, Ev 187, AA 495, COL 156, 7BC 913, 926, CT 14, LS 324, PP 140, LSM 140, 6T 67, 363, 8T 177, 9T 104, TM 465). He stands there today on our behalf before the Father (MYP 407, 3T 396, TM 157), in Heaven in the Presence of God (MH 419, Ev 187, CSW 124, Ed 132 SC 74, 8T 128, 9T 103, TM 391). He is interceding as a personal Savior (MH 419, Ed 132), on the sinner's behalf (PP 140, 6T 364, 8T 178). His Mediatorial Intercession in the Sanctuary in Heaven is as essential to the plan of salvation as was His death on Calvary (GC 489), and we are to be comforted by the thought of it (4T 530), for through this Intercessory work, He introduces His people to God as His sons and daughters (6T 363). Well may we proclaim by voice and by pen the wonderful truth of Christ's Intercession on our behalf (ChS 130), for He lives to make intercession for us (2T 591-592), and it is for you and me as a golden chain fastened to the throne of God (7BC 914), through which our petitions are presented to our Heavenly Father (4T 530) and God is brought near to us (SD 77). Never forget that the need of mankind for this Intercession is constant (6BC 1078), for through it Christ is pleading for us (AA 552, TM 92), but not as a mere petitioner, but as a Conqueror, claiming the victory on our behalf (COL 156). He is pleading our individual cases (2SM 249-250), and presenting His spotless merits with our prayers, confessions, and thanksgiving (COL 156). Thank God every day for the Mediatorial Work of Christ in our behalf!

17 - THE THRONES IN HEAVEN

"There are about a dozen statements in the New Testament where it says Christ sat—entered and went and sat down—at the right hand of God, or sat down on the throne of God. 'I overcame and am sat down with My Father on His throne.' Rev 3. A dozen times it says He entered straight into the Presence of God. Adventists have sometimes tried to get around this by inventing a movable throne. (laughter) Now whether that means that the Ark is left behind in the Mercy Seat in there, and just some other aspect of the throne comes out, I'm not sure. But the Spirit of Prophecy is very clear that the Most Holy place, and never the Holy, was

the center of the Divine work of Atonement. And there is no Biblical basis for moving the throne, none whatever."

Daniel Seven is one of the most forceful expositions on the Investigative Judgment given in Scripture, and it clearly shows a reseating of thrones. We have already carefully studied this. In Daniel 7:9, the "casting down" of thrones is the placing of thrones. The custom of ancient times was to set down cushions on the floor for a meeting. Folk would be seated on them or recline against them. They did not use chairs back in ancient times. This ancient method continues today in much of the Orient. If you have seen pictures of the interior of a Japanese home you will understand this. Daniel Seven reveals a re-setting of seats for Divinity for the Commencement of the Judgment. First, we have the rule of the Little Horn Power (Dan 7:7-8, 19-21, 23-25 and Dan 8:9-13). This is followed by the beginning of the Judgment (Dan 7:9, 22, 26), which in Daniel 8 is called the Cleansing or Restoration of the Sanctuary (Dan 8:14). Here are the events in this Judgment or Cleansing: The Ancient of Days comes (7:22) and the thrones being placed, He did sit (7:9). Then One like the Son of man comes to Him, and He is brought near before Him (7:13). Ten thousand times ten thousand stand before Him, and thousand thousands minister unto Him; the Judgment is set and the books are opened (7:10). The Examination and Cleansing and Restoration of the Records of Heaven commences (7:10; 8:14). Judgment or decisions are rendered on behalf of each of God's professed people (7:22). This Judgment results in a taking away of the dominion of the Little Horn Beast (7:26), and a giving of it unto the Son (7:14) and to His people (7:27). No longer will this wicked power be able to practice and prosper and cast truth to the ground (8:12), and to destroy the sanctuary truth—the truth of the Mediating Work of Christ—from the minds of the people (8:11). The Son of man shall receive the Kingdom (7:14), and His people with Him (7:22, 27). The Little Horn Beast will be destroyed in burning flame (7:11). The Son will rule forever, and His people with Him, and all dominions shall serve and obey Him forever (7:14, 22, 27).

Note that the four views of the Judgment given in Daniel Seven and Eight come after the 1260 Years of Little Horn Rule are past (Dan 7:25 with 26; compare Rev 12:6, 11:2-3), and it commences with the end of the 2300 Years of Daniel 8:18. The Investigative Judgment does not begin at the Ascension of Christ.

The Word of God reveals two primary aspects of the position of Christ in Heaven following His Ascension: First it reveals that He ascended to the throne of God (Rev 12:5) and that He is enthroned there with His Father (Rev 3:21—quoted by Dr. Ford). But there is also a second aspect to His Heavenly role since His Ascension to Heaven. This is His Mediation on behalf of His people before His Father. This is His Work as our High Priest in the Great Sanctuary in Heaven on our behalf. This is the aspect of His mediation and intercession that He has carried on for us since 31 A.D. There are many passages that refer to this Mediatorial Work for us. Here are a few: Rom 8:34; 1 Tim 2:5; Heb 2:17; 3:1; 4:14-15; 5:5; 6:19-20; 7:25-26;

8:1, 6; 9:11, 15, 24; 10:21; 12:24; 1 Jn 2:1. This is by no means a complete listing. Truly, He can say "Heaven is my throne" (Ac 7:49), and in the Sanctuary in Heaven He pleads our cases before the Father (Rom 8:34, Hebrews, etc.). We today may "come boldly unto the throne of grace" that our High Priest may minister to our needs (Heb 4:16). This is His mediatorial work. Our High Priest is set on the right hand of this throne (Heb 8:1), and He is set down at this throne (Heb 12:2). Whether He stands pleading, as is indicated in some passages of Scripture, or is set pleading, as in others, is not really the issue, is it? It seems to me that Ford is making an issue regarding "set" and "thrones" where no issue is. The issue is whether He is our High Priest in the Sanctuary above, not whether He is sitting or standing in the conducting of it. I have seen from an examination of Scripture that there are far fewer passages speaking of Jesus sitting on a throne between 31 A.D. and the Second Advent, than there are passages speaking of His mediatorial and intercessory work during that time. In general, about as many passages are to be found in Scripture dealing with His enthronement after His Second Coming as before it. Consider, for example, Matt 19:28, 26:64; Lk 22:28-30, 1:32-1:32-33 and elsewhere in both the Old and New Testaments. "When the Son of man shall come in His glory, and all the holy angels with Him, then shall He sit upon the throne of His glory." Matthew 25:31. The context of this passage in Matthew refers to the commencement of the Kingdom of Glory at His Second Advent. Prior to that time is the Kingdom of Grace. Both are explained in Great Controversy, pages 347-348. Both would involve a throne, for both are kingdoms. But the Kingdom of Grace would also involve a Priesthood, according to the book of Hebrews (Heb 4:14-16, and 7:25, for example). Revelation 4, 5, and 7 speak much about this throne and those sitting upon it. We may especially note that One sat upon the throne (4:2, etc.) and, also, that there was a Lamb "in the midst" of the throne (5:6). Then, we are told that this Lamb "came" and took the book out of the right hand of Him that sat upon the throne (5:7). Later songs of praise are sung to the One that sitteth upon the throne, and unto the Lamb (5:13 and 7:10). I believe that we are dealing with something here that we do not fully understand, for it has not been fully revealed to us. We cannot penetrate any deeper into the mystery of the Throne at the Center of the Universe than our Maker wishes to reveal it. It would appear that silence here would be wisdom. But though we cannot fully understand the position of our High Priest in relation to the Throne, we can yet clearly know that He is carrying on a Work of Grace before or in that Throne. And we can know, without a doubt, from the Bible alone, or from the Spirit of Prophecy alone, that He is now Mediating in the Pattern Sanctuary of Two Apartments that the sanctuary on earth was copied after (read the excellent Bible study on this topic in Great Controversy, pages 412:4-418:1, 420:2-422:0). And we can also know that this work, having now begun within the Second Apartment of that Sanctuary, will soon end—and instead of quibbling over the Judgment, we had better prepare to meet it!

18 - BIBLE PROPHECY IS IMPORTANT

"And if some wish, here, at this point, to say that Sister White saw in vision the Father arise and enter a flaming chariot, and go from the Holy to the Most Holy, I would remind you that you should read—closely—what the Seventh-day Adventist Commentary says on the nature of symbolic vision in its notes on Ezekiel One, a special note at the end of Ezekiel One, where it points out that the prophets didn't see the actual, but saw a representation that was meant to teach them something Apocalyptic visions are not to be taken as graphical, literal representations of the unseen, my friends. They are sketches within the experience and culture of the contemporary prophet, to teach them something. Very important to understand that."

This is indeed an interesting lecture that is here being delivered to our young people. Dr. Ford has his concepts, although not his Scripture, very much in hand in this lecture which probably is a distillation of that which he has been teaching in his college courses for many years to our future workers and leaders.

In this lecture, everything that would support the pioneer Advent view on the Sanctuary is either ignored (such as the thorough Bible studies on our Sanctuary Message, given in Great Controversy, chapters 23, 24, and 28; or the truths given in Daniel Seven), ridiculed (Hiram Edson's insight into the truth of Exodus 25:8, 40, Hebrews 8:1-5, and Daniel 8:14), underrated (the cleansing of the Sanctuary in Leviticus 16; or the importance of the book, Great Controversy), or denied (the truth of ta hagia and Christ's Ascension entry into the Sanctuary in Hebrews Nine).

But now we have something new: A sweeping attack on the value of Prophetic Guidance itself. The Early Writings 54-56 section that graphically describes in vision the actual passage of the Father and the Son from the First to the Second Apartment in 1844 is relegated to the imaginary scrapheap of visions, prophetic instruction, and similar confusion. Dr. Ford will even attempt to destroy Inspiration in order to further his own thinking. Nothing is too sacred for Dr. Ford. We shall soon witness in this lecture a full scale onslaught against Inspiration, both of the Bible as well as of the Spirit of Prophecy. Why have we, who are older, not protected our youth from the insidious and determined efforts of men such as this? It is an operating policy of Roman Catholicism to generally transfer problems to another field, rather than to discharge them. If a priest is immoral he is merely sent to a distant parish to continue his activities,—but if a teacher is found to be teaching error he is discharged immediately.

The experience that occurred in October of 1844 is given us as an actual reality in Early Writings 54-56. But true to the approach he frequently uses in this lecture, Dr. Ford does not directly deny the Gift of Prophecy, but instead works to underrate and nullify that which it produced. Robert Brinsmead, Geoffrey Paxton and Desmond Ford carefully work in certain

lines. They will never be found directly denying the Prophetic Gift given us in the Bible and the Spirit of Prophecy. But by their subtle thrusts, parries and attacks they accomplish the same work.

We are here told that what a prophet is given in vision isn't really true—it's only imaginary somethings designed to teach some kind of lesson to the prophet himself! Sort of a secret series of cloud-like constructions that, we hope, at least taught the prophet something. But the figments and vapors of it all left the rest of us in confusion. This is Ford's view of Prophetic Guidance.

"All Scripture is given by Inspiration of God, and is profitable for doctrine, for reproof, for correction, for instruction in righteousness." 2 Timothy 3:16. (Lk 8:21, 2 Pet 1:21, Heb 1:1-2, Rev 1:1-3, Ps 119:105, Jn 17:17, Job 23:12, Isa 40:8, Matt 24:35, Jn 5:39, Ac 17:11, 2 Tim 3:15, Lk 24:45, Matt 22:29) "When ye therefore shall see the abomination of desolation, spoken of by Daniel the prophet, stand in the holy place, (whoso readeth, let him understand)." Matthew 24:15. "Blessed is he that readeth, and they that hear the words of this prophecy [the book of Revelation], and keep those things which are written therein: for the time is at hand." Revelation 1:3. "But He said, Yea, rather, blessed are they that hear the Word of God, and keep it." Luke 11:28. "To the Law and to the Testimony: if they speak not according to this Word, it is because there is no light in them." Isaiah 8:20.

And what lesson are we to learn from the vision of the Father and the Son moving from the First to the Second Apartment in 1844? Ford clearly infers that it does not mean that they went from the First to the Second Apartment. Well, what then does it mean! This prophetic view of Early Writings 54-56, that so beautifully harmonizes with and fills in the picture given in Daniel Seven (9:9-10, 13, 22, 26), we are here told is of no practical instructional value whatsoever. And where is all this teaching of Ford inevitably to lead us? Obviously, the visions of Daniel and John the Revelator are also to be reckoned as worthless. If we accept this mythologizing approach to prophetic visions, we have had destroyed before us the vision prophecies of Daniel, Revelation, most of the major and the minor prophets, much of the writings of Moses, Great Controversy and the rest of the Conflict of the Ages Series, most of the Testimonies, Early Writings, and the greater part of what remains of the Spirit of Prophecy. A vision is a view, an understanding given by God through His prophet to His people (cf. Rev 1:1-3, Rom 15:4, etc.). This work to destroy the instructional value of Inspiration is one of the most diabolical of Dr. Ford's teaching objectives.

Dr. Ford, you would annihilate the teaching value of the Bible and the Spirit of Prophecy from the hearts of the people if only you could reach your self-appointed goal of becoming in our day the honored master-theologian to the Adventist denomination. Nothing is sacred to you. Nothing is secure from your hands. Neither the Bible nor the Spirit of Prophecy, nor friends nor veteran workers. Everything must bow before your doctrinal views, or you declare war upon it.

19 - MEN WHO SEARCH FOR DOUBT

"When you read in Jeremiah chapter 13, about the prophet Jeremiah being told to take a girdle and take it to the Euphrates and after seventy days go and get it back. You might think that was next door. It was a thousand miles away. And you and I didn't exist then. (laughter) He didn't go to the Euphrates nor did he go and get it back. It was all done in vision . . . And some of the things that Hosea did that may seem to shock you—you find the same key of explanation,—so within the veil sitting on the right hand of God can only mean the Most Holy Place."

You see when a prophet says something, he doesn't really mean it, when God tells him to do it, it's not really done, and you and I didn't exist then anyway, and when you find things in Scripture you don't understand, you use the key of explaining it all away—and that is how we can know that within the veil sitting on the right hand of God can only mean the Most Holy Place.

There are certain passages in Scripture that we do not understand. They have not been clearly revealed to us. But the greater majority of Scripture is not in this category. We can readily grasp the essential details, that we may apply them to our own lives, and our understanding of Bible prophecy, and of doctrinal truth. Dr. Ford would lead our youth to the less-understood portions and use them to discredit the rest of Scripture in their minds. Read Great Controversy, 526:1-528:2 for further insight into the work of those men who would destroy the Word of God with their doubting, and 520:1-522:2 to better understand their method of twisting and splitting Scripture and turning it into fables. 522:4-524:0, and 525:3-4 tell of those who would be wiser than their Creator, and the destroying effects of their fablizing of Scripture. Chapter Eleven of Steps to Christ. "What to Do with Doubt," contains many insights into these matters. And note page 111—"Disguise it as they may, the real cause of doubt and skepticism [in regard to the Word of God], in most cases, is the love of sin."

"Many wander in the mazes of philosophy, in search of reasons and evidence which they will never find, while they reject the evidence which God has been pleased to give . . . All who persist in this course will fail to come to a knowledge of the truth. God will never remove every occasion for doubt. He gives sufficient evidence on which to base faith, and if this is not accepted, the mind is left in darkness." Patriarchs and Prophets, 432:2.

20 - THE BLOOD TAKEN INTO THE SANCTUARY

"We've said many things in connection with the Sanctuary that won't stand. We've spoken about how every day the blood went into the Holy Place and was sprinkled there and so it became defiled. Two errors there: (1) The blood usually didn't go into the Holy Place at all. Very, very rarely, the

blood went into the Holy Place. Usually it was poured outside of the altar. (2) We speak about blood defiling. You will not anywhere in Scripture there is the blood of the sacrifice ever defile. It is always presented as cleansing. Always. "The blood of Jesus Christ cleanseth us from all sin." Well, there's nothing adequate in print, on this topic, so I had a few swipes at it in print, but knew if I was very frank it would never be published. So I said as much as I could about it, beginning back in the '50's and have had some things published, touching on the problem." [This paragraph—sic.]

In the earthly type, the blood came from animal sacrifices. There were Daily sacrifices and Yearly sacrifices. Blood from the Daily sacrifices regularly went into the Holy Place, or First Apartment. We are told about these sacrifices in the first seven chapters of Leviticus. As we have seen from our earlier study of Daniel 8, Leviticus 16 and Hebrews 9, the blood of the Sin Offering was especially significant, and was the connecting link between the Daily and the Yearly, being offered in both services. Four sin offerings are described in Leviticus 4. For a ruler or one of the people, the blood of the sacrifice was poured out at the base of the altar (4:25, 34). But in the case of a sin offering for the priest or for the entire congregation, it was carried into the Holy Place—the First Apartment—and was sprinkled "seven times before the Lord, before the veil of the sanctuary," (4:5-6, 16-17), and some of it was placed upon the Golden Altar of Incense that stood in the First Apartment nearest to the Presence of God (4:7, 18). Quite obviously, the blood of the Sin Offering on behalf of all of God's people was taken into the Sanctuary in the Daily ministration. In order to avoid an excess of passage in the First Apartment, our Heavenly Father wisely arranged that there not be a continual movement into and out of it. But to use this fact as a basis for denying the truth of blood being regularly —daily— taken into the First Apartment is a perversion of Scriptural interpretation. The blood of the offering was taken directly into the First Apartment, or the flesh was eaten by the priest. Either the blood was brought into the Holy Place and the flesh itself burned without the camp, or the flesh of the offering was eaten by the priests (Lev 4:12, 21; 6:26, 29), and eaten in the Holy Place (Lev 10:18). "Behold, the blood of it was not brought in within the Holy Place: ye should indeed have eaten it in the Holy Place as I commanded." Leviticus 10:18. When the blood was not directly brought into the Sanctuary, why was the flesh to be eaten by the priest? By eating the flesh, the sin was transferred to the priest. "Wherefore have ye not eaten the sin offering in the Holy Place, seeing it is most holy, and God hath given it you to bear the iniquity of the congregation, to make atonement for them before the Lord." Leviticus 10:17. By this act, the priest took upon himself the "iniquity of the congregation" (Lev 6:26; 10:17). In doing this, the priest is symbolic of Him who "bare the sin of many," upon whom the Lord laid "the iniquity of us all" (Isa. 53:12, 6). He was made "an offering for sin" (Isa 53:10), and because of it, He shall "justify many; for He shall bear their iniquities." (Isa 53:11). He "bore our sins" (Heb 9:28; 1 Pet 2:24).

Christ "died for our sins" (I Cor 15:3), and He who knew no sin was made "to be sin for us" (2 Cor 5:21), for He "gave Himself for our sins" (Gal 1:4).

In the type, the priest could not personally atone for sin by giving his own life, as Christ in the antitype did, and so the earthly priest gave his own sin offering which was carried into the Holy Place and there sprinkled. (Lev 4:5-6). So, in every case, the blood atonement/or every man was ultimately brought into the First Apartment and sprinkled within it. "The life of the flesh is in the blood, and I have given it to you upon the altar to make an atonement for your souls, for it is the blood that maketh an atonement for the soul." Leviticus 17:11.

And this work of mediating His blood on our behalf, Christ began when He entered the First Apartment of the Heavenly Sanctuary at His Ascension. It is the blood of Christ that saves us from sin (Matt 26:28, Jn 6:56; 19:34, Ac 20:28, Rom 5:9, Col 1:20, 1 Pet 1:18-19). In His blood our sins are cleansed and removed (Heb 9:14, 1 Jn 1:7, Rev 1:5; 7:14). It is clear from Scripture that the blood of Christ cleanses. It is just as clear that sin defiles (Matt 15:19-20). Not only does sin defile a man, it also defiles whatever it touches. Adultery defiles the land and the sanctuary (Ez 23:37-38). Murder defiles the land (Num 35:33). Profaning the Sabbath defiles both the Sabbath and the Sanctuary (Ezek 23:38). Uncleanliness defiles the tabernacle (Lev 15:31; 16:16). Worship of Molech defiles the tabernacle (Lev 20:3). In all these cases it is sin that defiles,—the land, the Sabbath, the Sanctuary, and the human heart. Sin defiles what it touches. It is for this reason that there was a Day of Atonement—to remove this defilement. But this is the truth that Dr. Ford wants to remove from our landmarks. The message of the Advent Movement is that there is a Day of Atonement to blot out sin. The message of Desmond Ford is to blot out the Day of Atonement.

The sin of God's people is written where the blood representing the sinner has been placed (Jer 17:11), and it is the work of the Day of Atonement to remove this sin—to cleanse it from the Sanctuary (Lev 16:14-16, 18-19, 29-34). Christ was made "to be sin for us, who knew no sin" (2 Cor 5:21). He "poured out His soul unto death" (Isa 53:12), that He might be made "an offering for sin" (Isa 53:10). He bore "the sin of many" (2 Cor 5:21), and entered with His own blood into the Sanctuary on our behalf (Heb 9:12) in order "that He might be a merciful and faithful High Priest" "to make reconciliation for the sins of the people" (Heb 2:17).

We have seen from the Bible that it was not a "rare" thing for blood to be brought into the Sanctuary (and Great Controversy, 418:1-2 says it was done from day to day). And we have seen that it was the sin of the people that defiled the Sanctuary. Dr. Ford is here making a false issue over "blood defilement." The issue in the great controversy and in the Sanctuary Service was sin defilement, not blood defilement. The Spirit of Prophecy is concerned with sin defilement and blood cleansing; Man's defilement by sin is cleansed by Christ's blood (SC 28-9, 8 T 291), Christ's blood is a fountain for cleansing from sin (4T 625), His blood is presented for the sinner's short-

comings (1SM 344), Sin's brand is effaced only through the Antitypical blood (1SM 371), and the sins of the faithful are removed from the Heavenly Sanctuary by the blood of Christ (GC 421-22).

An excellent summary of the Biblical material on this is to be found in Great Controversy, pages 417:2-421:0. Here is a brief survey of what you will find there: The sinner brought a substitute (lamb, goat, etc.), symbolizing Christ, to the altar, confessed his sin, and placed his hands on the substitute's head, thereby, in figure, transferring his sin to the substitute's. The substitute was then slain and its blood taken into the Sanctuary (either directly into the First Apartment, or by the sin having been transferred to the priest by his eating of it, and then taken into the First Apartment when the blood from the priest's sin offering was taken within it). In the earthly, the transferral of sin to the tabernacle was done in symbol. In the Heavenly, the transferral of sin to the Sanctuary is done in reality. In the act of confessing his sin over the victim and placing his hands on its head, the sin was transferred from the sinner to the substitute. The innocent substitute "became sin" in place of the repentant sinner. The life is in the blood, and the blood of the substitute, offered up—slain—on behalf of the man, took away the man's sin (although the sin was not cancelled for, as we will see below, though forgiven, it can still be rolled back upon us prior to the Final Atonement). This blood, the "life" of the victim, was then taken into the First Apartment, and there sprinkled nearest to the presence of God, upon the dividing veil. In this way sin was transferred to the Sanctuary. In the whole process, the sinner was being loosed from his sin by the Blood, and the Sanctuary was being defiled by the sin. For by the sin being transferred from the sinner to the innocent victim (in symbol in the type, and in reality in the antitype), the victim became identified with the sin. It "became sin" and the sin it now bore defiled the Sanctuary. It was the sin of the sinner which was defiling the Sanctuary, not the blood. I do not know of any location in the Bible or Spirit of Prophecy that directly says that the blood defiled the Sanctuary. It was the sin through the blood which defiled it. Note, for example, the careful wording in the middle of page 418 of Great Controversy. Consider also Jeremiah 17:1 and Leviticus 11:17, 16:19. The blood represented or stood in place of the life of the sinner (GC 418:1), but the blood, itself, was the blood of the substitute. And it was always cleansing. In the Daily it is pardoning the sinner, and transferring his sin to the Sanctuary. This aspect of the Daily continues in the Yearly until the Records of the Living having been examined, the blood is placed on the Mercy Seat. Then the Sanctuary is cleansed, and probationary time being closed, those are "cut off" who did not take part in the Yearly Service by the putting away of their sins and earnestly seeking the mercy of God. We live in a solemn time. (In support of these last three sentences, read Great Controversy, chapter 28 and Leviticus 16.) Having read the above summary, now read Great Controversy 417:2-422:0 and also Patriarchs and Prophets 352:3, 354:2-358:0. If you find something there that disagrees with this summary, then ignore that part of the summary. You will note that the scapegoat trans-

action is not summarized here. It is clearly stated in the Spirit of Prophecy (GC 419:2, 422:2, PP 355:2-3, 358:1-3), is not contested by Dr. Ford, and therefore need not fill space here. In regard to the transferral of sin, what was done in symbol on earth is done in fact in Heaven (GC 421 :3); that which was done in type on earth is done in reality in Heaven (GC 420:2). On the Day of Atonement this defilement was removed from the Heavenly Sanctuary (GC 420:1, 421:3-422:0). Sin is actually being removed now from the Sanctuary. If we on earth are not participating in this solemn service by putting away sin from our lives, then we will come up to the time of the Final Atonement and not be prepared for its sentence. This is the Third Angel's Message. "Fear God and give glory to Him for the Hour of His Judgment is come, and worship Him." And this Message we are to give to the world at this time. Carefully read Great Controversy 424:4-425:2 for this definition of the Third Angel's Message and our need to put away our sins, and also read Early Writings 254:1-256:2 in order to learn where the Third Angel is pointing us. Thus Great Controversy is one of the most important books we have—for chapters 23 and onward in careful detail give us the fulness of the Third Angel's Message. Many err in thinking that "how" the Righteousness of Christ is initially imputed to them is the message of "what" the Righteousness of Christ is. But the complete message is more than how God imputes it as our own. It is also how God makes it our own. As will be seen in our separate study on the Righteousness of Christ, imputation is followed by obedience. (This study is primarily a compilation of Bible, Spirit of Prophecy, Waggoner and Jones quotations.) The "what" of the Righteousness of Christ, the standard in these last days that will be so much contested is extremely important, and only those who are studying the Bible and the Spirit of Prophecy for themselves, and in the strength of Christ are putting away their sins and practicing that standard, will be prepared for the solemn hour when the Judgment will Pass to the Living (GC 486:1-491:2).

In the Daily, our sins are confessed and transferred to the Sanctuary above. In the Yearly, they are blotted out of existence (GC 483:1-486:2). But prior to that time, if we choose to return to our sins, and ultimately refuse to separate from them, they will be rolled back on us, and we will still have to bear in our own persons the full accountability for them in the final execution of the Judgment (GC 420:1, 483:1, 486:2, COL 251:2, and DA 763:3-764:1).

Specifically, it is sin that defiles the Sanctuary. Our lives having come into fellowship with it have become defiled. In the Daily, as we repent and forsake them in the strength of Christ, our sins are transferred, in fact, to the Sanctuary in Heaven, and in the Yearly, Jesus cleanses the Record of our Sins from the Record Books of the Sanctuary. In the Type, the blood representing, in symbol, the life of the sinner was taken into the Earthly Sanctuary, and thereby, in figure, defiled it. In the Antitype, the actual sin of the humble, repentant, believing sinner is taken to the Heavenly Sanctuary, and there defiles it in reality. The Yearly Service, by careful examination of the records, removes this defilement on behalf of those who are

found to be worthy of receiving it (GC chapter 23 and 28).

21 - INVESTIGATION AND BLOTTING OUT BEGAN IN 1844

"What shall we say about it? Well, the first thing I must say is in answer to what you will say, 'But, Ellen White—.' So let me point out to you that Ellen White clearly teaches that Christ went into the most holy place at His ascension." [And then Dr. Ford quotes five passages from the Spirit of Prophecy.]

Quotation One: Signs of the Times, April 19, 1905. This is the strongest of the five statements in support of his contention that Ellen White believed and taught an immediate entrance by Christ into the Second Apartment at His Ascension. Unfortunately, I do not have here the volumes containing the "Signs" articles, and therefore am unable to quote this passage accurately. This is due to the fact that in this lecture Dr. Ford successively quotes it in two different ways. (1) "Still bearing humanity, He [Christ] ascended to heaven, triumphant and victorious. He has sprinkled the blood of the atonement on the mercy seat." (2) "Still victorious. He has taken the blood of the atonement into the holiest of all, and sprinkled it on the mercy seat." There are two ways in which we can view this passage, and either one is Biblically sound and correct: [a] This passage is in the style of many in Scripture: it is a sweeping view of the whole work of the Atonement. Gen 3:15 and Revelation 12 are two of many such examples of this. Each is an overall view, but with many details being left out that are filled in elsewhere in Scripture. As an overall view, it is thus in harmony with the clear and most specific details given in Great Controversy, chapter 23, and elsewhere. In other words, it would be a predictive quotation, providing, prophetically, a sweeping view of past, present, and future.

[b] Having said that, I will face this quotation in just the manner as Dr. Ford presents it to us: Jesus Ascended to Heaven. He has taken the blood into the Most Holy Place and sprinkled it on the Mercy Seat.—And this is exactly right. This is exactly what Jesus has done. Prior to 1844, this could not be written (except as a prophetic—predictive view) But since then it can be written as a factual, present view. For in 1844, Jesus began the work of investigation and blotting out of sin. It has continued from that time to the present, and soon will pass to the cases of the living, and then probation will close. In every instance either names or sins are blotted out. Carefully read Great Controversy, 483:1, 486:1, and 490:1-2 for a clear view of this. It accords fully with the Signs quotation, given above.

Christ is man's Advocate before the Mercy Seat (6T 364), for He pleads before it for sinners (GC 415). From it, God, today, dispenses pardon to repentant sinners (6T 364). "The work of Christ in the Sanctuary above, presenting His own blood each moment before the Mercy Seat, as He makes intercession for us, should have its full impression upon the

heart, that we may realize the worth of each moment." Counsels on Sabbath School Work, 111:2.

22 - BALLENGER—THE SANCTUARY AND THE LANDMARKS

"I would point out to you that after Ballenger had written his books on this topic, he and Andrews, a very devout Adventist scholar, for the first time went into print as saying, 'Yes, within the veil does mean the Most Holy Place, and Christ did go there, immediately ascended.' But of course Andrews had to get out of it some way, so he said 'He went in and he came out again, and went back in the First [Apartment].' "

For the second time in this lecture, Dr. Ford refers to Ballenger. He has good reason to. Albion Fox Ballenger (1861-1921) was one of the best-known apostasies over the Sanctuary issue in the history of our church. Dr. Ford well knows that he is teaching the very same error that Ballenger taught, and that Ellen White clearly and decidedly rejected Ballenger's view as "specious error." E.W. Farnsworth, in 1905, described Ballenger's teachings in these words: When Jesus "ascended, He went immediately into the Most Holy Place, and that His ministry has been carried on there ever since," and that Ballenger claims that Hebrews 6:19, "within the veil" refers to the Most Holy Place. Ballenger's teaching here is identical to that of Desmond B. Ford's. Ellen White wrote this in warning about the teachings of A.F. Ballenger:

"In clear, plain language I am to say to those in attendance at this [General] conference [of 1905] that Brother Ballenger has been allowing his mind to receive and believe specious error. He has been misinterpreting and misapplying the scriptures upon which he has fastened his mind. He is building up theories that are not founded in truth. A warning is now to come to him and to the people; for God has not indited the message that he is bearing. This message, if accepted, would undermine the pillars of our faith . . . If the theories that Brother Ballenger presents were received, they would lead many to depart from the faith. They would counterwork the truths upon which the people of God have stood for the past fifty years. I am bidden to say in the name of the Lord that Elder Ballenger is following a false light. The Lord has not given him the message that he is bearing regarding the Sanctuary Service . . . I have a warning for those who suppose that they have been given the work of revealing Scripture in a new light. This work means substituting human interpretation for the interpretation that God has given. Thus did the heavenly messengers pronounce upon the effort into which Brother Ballenger has entered."—Manuscript 62, 1905.

"Elder Ballenger thinks that he has new light, and is burdened to give it to the people; but the Lord has instructed me that he has misapplied texts of Scripture, and given them a wrong application. The word of God is always the truth, but the doctrines that Elder Ballenger advances, if received, would unsettle

our faith in the Sanctuary question."—Manuscript 145, 1905.

Speaking of the Ballenger heresy, she wrote: "When the power of God testifies as to what is truth, that truth is to stand forever as the truth. No after-suppositions contrary to the light God has given are to be entertained . . . We are not to receive the words of those who come with a message that contradicts the special points of our faith . . . While the Scriptures are God's word, and are to be respected, the application of them, if such application moves one pillar of the foundation that God has sustained these fifty years [in 1905] is a great mistake."—Letter 329, 1905. (Letter 329 is also in 1 Selected Messages, 160-162.)

"It is impossible for us to have any agreement with the positions taken by Brother A.F. Ballenger; for no lie is of the truth. His proofs do not belong where he places them, and although he may lead minds to believe his theory in regard to the Sanctuary, this is no evidence that his theory is true."—Letter to W.W. Simpson, January 30, 1906.

"Elder Ballenger's proofs are not reliable. If received, they would destroy the faith of God's people in the truth that has made us what we are. We must be decided on this subject; for the points that he is trying to prove by scripture are not sound . . . We were directed by the angels of God. It was under the guidance of the Holy Spirit that the presentation of the Sanctuary question [the Sanctuary doctrine] was given. It is eloquence for every one to keep silent in regard to the features of our faith in which they acted no part. God never contradicts Himself. Scripture proofs are misapplied if forced to testify to that which is not true. Another and still another will arise, and bring in supposedly great light, and make their assertions. But we stand by the old landmarks."—Letter to John Burden, December 11, 1905.

We are told what the "landmarks" are in Counsels to Writers and Editors, page 30. They are four in number, and are not subject to change: [1] the cleansing of the Sanctuary, [2] the Three Angels' Messages, [3] the Law and the Sabbath in relation to God's temple in heaven, and [4] "the nonimmortality of the wicked." You will find these four "landmarks" thoroughly explained in the book of the landmarks, Great Controversy. [1] in chapters 23, 24, and 28; [2] in chapter 25, [3] in chapter 26, and [4] in chapter 33. Never depart from the teachings of this book. Great Controversy is the only accurate comprehensive doctrinal book that we publish.

"Those who seek to remove the old landmarks are not holding fast; they are not remembering how they have received and heard . . . I am bidden to say in the name of the Lord that Elder Ballenger is following a false light. The Lord has not sent him the message that he is bearing regarding the Sanctuary Service. Our Instructor spoke words to Brother Ballenger: 'You are bringing in confusion and perplexity by your interpretation of the Scriptures. You think that you have been given new light, but your light will become darkness to those who receive it . . . Those who receive your interpretation of Scripture regarding the Sanctuary Service are receiving error and following in false paths. The enemy will work the minds of those

who are eager for something new, preparing them to receive false theories and false expositions of the Scripture."—Manuscript 62, 1905.

23 - DESTROYING CONFIDENCE IN THE WRITINGS

"Listen to this one from Acts of the Apostles, page 33, and please note that Ellen White here as in many other places was a rebel. The greatest rebel we've ever had amongst us was Ellen White. No other Adventist writer would have dared to write some of the things she wrote. I'm so glad she wrote them . . . Listen to this one from Acts of the Apostles. It's a wonder the editors didn't wipe it out."

With this stunning introduction, Dr. Ford prepares us for four quotations from the Spirit of Prophecy that he has culled out over the years to "prove" his contention that Christ went into the Most Holy Place at His Ascension. He realizes that none of these quotations (nor the one that preceded them) actually say this, and so he uses a dramatic introduction to prepare our minds to imagine that we can, after all, see in those quickly read passages, what in fact, is not really there.

The inference given in this introduction is, nonetheless, a sinister one: Ford is implanting in the minds of our young people the idea that our publishing houses regularly censored—cut out—various passages from her books, and that occasionally one slipped by. The thought here is that what we read in her writings is not actually her own thoughts, but rather is the editorial product of her book publishers. Of course, if such an idea be once entertained, Dr. Ford's objective is met—to destroy our confidence in the Spirit of Prophecy, and to stop our reading of it, that our attention may be turned to Dr. Ford's wise counsels. There are many spirits gone abroad in our day that would seek to tear down the Prophetic Gift through Ellen White, and remove it from our lives and our Church. Refuse to listen to them. They are friendly little agents from Satan. First they will strip you of your protection. And then they will entrap you with their own speculations and theories.

24 - CHRIST WAS NOT A LITERAL PRIEST ON EARTH

[Acts of the Apostles, page 33:3 is partially quoted] ... It was the Day of Atonement from the Incarnation here, she says. Now, please don't go out and say 'Des Ford says, 'The Day of Atonement began at the Incarnation.' Please go out and say, 'Ellen White says,' I didn't write Acts of the Apostles. I wish I could have (laughter)."

Quotation Two: Acts of the Apostles, page 33:3. We need not quote this paragraph here, for you can as easily turn to it in your own home. Carefully read it. It says nothing about Christ's entry into the Most Holy Place at His Ascension, or about the Day of

Atonement occurring at the Cross. Ford can try to read his "research" into it, but when all is said and done, that is all he is doing—reading in, not reading out. And it says nothing else that would mark Ellen White as a "rebel." Dr. Ford is trying to read into it one of his favorite errors: The concept that Christ completed His Sanctuary priestly Mediation at Calvary, with little or nothing left to do in Heaven afterward. "Christ laid aside His royal robes and garbed Himself with humanity and offered sacrifice, Himself the priest, Himself the victim." This is either symbolic or literal. If symbolic, then it refers to the work consistently expressed elsewhere throughout the Spirit of Prophecy regarding the timing and procedure of Christ's Priesthood on behalf of mankind. If literal, then Christ literally as an earthly priest slew Himself at Calvary. Of course, this would be unscriptural, for the Bible clearly tells us that Christ was not a priest on earth. "For every high priest is ordained to offer gifts and sacrifices, wherefore it is of necessity that this Man have something also to offer. For if He were on earth, He should not be a priest . . ." Hebrews 8:3-4. This is a definite part of Paul's argument in the book of Hebrews—that the Aaronite priests ministered on earth, but Jesus as our priest only ministers in Heaven. Again, we have here an excellent insight into the fact that Dr. Ford really has nothing on which to support his theories. Is this the best he can bring forth to overthrow the clear evidence in the Bible and the Spirit of Prophecy that reveals the Heavenly ministration of Christ in the Sanctuary on our behalf? In this Reply to Desmond Ford's October 27 Lecture, I here cite scores of Bible and Spirit of Prophecy references in support of our very Scriptural historic positions. This is by no means the result of brilliance, for the Word of God is filled with support of its own Truth. And we are here defending Truth. But in contrast, within his lecture Dr. Ford cited very, very little of Scripture—either Bible or of Spirit of Prophecy. Most of it was talk, theory, and aspersion, with an occasional quotation such as Acts of the Apostles, page 33:3 thrown in as "proof."

Acts of the Apostles 33:3, is as obvious a figurative representation as can be found in the Spirit of Prophecy. As the high priest laid aside one set of priestly robes for another, so Christ laid aside his royalty and clothed Himself with humanity, and sacrificed Himself for mankind. Since He was, literally as priest, to apply the blood of this sacrifice in Heaven, He was, in a figurative sense, the priest who provided it. He literally was to apply the blood atonement in Heaven. He literally as the Sacrifice provided the blood atonement on Calvary. But He did not literally officiate at Calvary as a priest, for He did not actually slay the sacrifice with a knife, while standing over it.

Jesus was not a priest on earth, but only after His Ascension to Heaven, according to the Bible (Heb 8:2-4). Dr. Ford claims that the Spirit of Prophecy teaches an earthly priesthood of Christ and the Day of Atonement in Antitype at Calvary, but this is not true. At Calvary "Jesus was earning the right to become the Advocate of men" (DA 745:0). In anticipation of His Sacrificial Death on earth and His Mediatorial Priesthood in Heaven, He could redeem men throughout the Old Testament and during His earthly life. The

priestly ministry on earth represented Christ's Priesthood in Heaven (GC 420-421). But it was not until His Ascension that He entered upon this priestly work on our behalf (GC 420-421, 430).

25 - TODAY AS A RESULT OF CHRIST'S WORK THE MERCY SEAT IS OPENED AND THE VEIL IS DRAWN ASIDE

"From the SDA Bible Commentary, Volume 5, 1109, 'The Mercy Seat, is opened to all who accept Christ as the propitiation for sin. The veil is rent, the partition wall is broken down. Christ came to demolish every wall of partition, to throw open every compartment of the temple.' This is Christ's Object Lessons, 386."

Quotations Three and Four: 5 Bible Commentary, 1109/1:1, and Christ's Object Lessons, 386:2. The above is a composite quotation from two books, and is quoted as Dr. Ford gave them. (The first somewhat differs from his rendition of it.) Read together, quickly, one might imagine that something new is to be found here. But a more careful reading of the two passages—either together or separately—reveals that they uniformly agree with our consistent position on these matters. Both passages tell us that Christ came to earth to enable us to fully come into the Presence of God. Ford would have us think that they teach something different—that Christ at His Ascension immediately entered the Second Apartment. Such cannot be true, for it would run entirely counter to the detailed instruction given elsewhere in the Spirit of Prophecy on this matter. One passage of Scripture should not be made to attack another. And viewing it all from when it was written, after 1844, the effect of Christ's work has, indeed, been to open the Mercy Seat to us. Note that these last three sentences in the 5 B.C. 1109 quotation are in the present tense: "[Christ's death, in past tense, then] The Mercy Seat, upon which the glory of God rested in the holiest of all, is opened . . . The veil is rent . . ." The passage from COL is even more figurative. Read it—COL 386:1. It should be remembered that there is also a separate "veil" concept in the Bible that is entirely different. This is the "veil of sin" concept, which you can read about in the following passages: Ex 33:33-35, Isa 25:7, 2 Cor 3:13-16. The veil of sin drawn over all nations that keeps them from beholding the truth of God, is drawn aside in Christ.

26 - CHRIST BEGAN HIS PRIESTLY WORK WHEN HE ASCENDED TO HEAVEN

"But the strongest statement I leave till last, it's never been noticed. We can read and read and read, and not know what we're reading. But in the book written after Great Controversy, the greatest book Ellen White ever wrote . . . Desire of Ages, the greatest book in the world, next to the Scripture. All this talk about Ellen White's plagiarism. Sure

she used other books in preparing this book . . . [As his fifth and last quotation, Dr. Ford reads from Desire of Ages, 756:5 bottom line and over through half of 757:0, then the middle and finally the last portion of 757:1] . . . 'No longer need sinful, sorrowing humanity await the coming of the high priest.' And then she quotes Hebrews 9:12 . . ."

There is a special reason why Dr. Ford so much appreciates Desire of Ages: It presents the earthly work of Christ and not the Investigative Judgment, Cleansing and Final Atonement by Christ after 1844, as given in Great Controversy. It emphasizes the Death of Christ on Calvary, rather than the Heavenly Mediation of Christ in the Sanctuary above, as described in Patriarchs and Prophets. It portrays beautiful lessons from His lips while only touching upon the Bible prophecies that apply to the papal supremacy of the Man of Sin, or those that speak of the Third Angel's Message and the Final Crisis, as given in Great Controversy. It provides encouraging instruction without the authoritative doctrinal presentations of the Testimonies.

Quotation Five: Desire of Ages 756:5-757:1. We have quite a few interesting remarks here. Some quoted; some for lack of space not quoted. As we shall see more fully developed later in this lecture, the thought is implied here that Great Controversy was an early and immature Spirit of Prophecy view of truth that is really not worthy of our notice today. The span of years between the writing of Great Controversy and Desire of Ages was actually not more than five to seven years, we are told by Elder A.L. White in his Reply to this lecture of Desmond Ford. In reality, Great Controversy as we now have it was one of her last books, being published in revised form, under her direct approval in 1911—only four years before her death.

A passing reference to Ellen White's "plagiarisms" is made, followed by an extensive listing of many, many authors that she quoted from. In my own library are several such volumes, and careful analysis has revealed no particular "extensive" quotations from other books by Desire of Ages. The concepts developed and the subject matter chosen for inclusion in these other works appears cheapened and insignificant, in comparison with the broad spiritual dimensions revealed in Desire of Ages.

When quoting the Desire of Ages passage, Dr. Ford quoted, "No longer need sinful, sorrowing humanity await the coming of the high priest," and then she quotes Hebrews 9:12 . . . In this way, he omits the next sentence, and passes on down to the bottom two lines. This is omitted: "Henceforth the Saviour was to officiate as priest and advocate in the heaven of heavens." This sentence would have unraveled much that he was trying to piece together here.

In his argument here, Dr. Ford again uses his method of misapplying the meaning of verses, from the Greek and from context, in Hebrews Nine. We have covered this in minute detail earlier in this Reply, and there is no reason to repeat it here. Two verses from Hebrews Nine, and one from Hebrews Ten, are quoted or referred to in Desire of Ages

757:1. In each, she, as usual, quotes them as they are given in the King James Version. As to her meaning of those verses, we should read her other commentaries on these verses as well as on the entire Sanctuary Service given in Great Controversy, chapter 23, 24, 28 and elsewhere.

The basis of Dr. Ford's usage of Desire of Ages 757:1 is the phrase, "The way into the holiest is laid open." This is from Hebrews 9:8. The King James Version incorrectly translates this passage as "holiest of all" when it is ta hagia ("holy places," or "Sanctuary") that is used here in 9:8, not hagia hagian as in 9:3 ("Holiest of all" or "Holy of Holies"). It is interesting that Dr. Ford here accepts this mistranslation of 9:8, but then below it, he tries to correct the reading of 9:12 "holy places" which is also ta hagia, and there correctly rendered. Ellen White quotes both 9:8 and 9:12 in the same paragraph, using as is her custom, the regular King James translation of it—and by this very fact disproves Ford's argument that she is talking about the Second Apartment here.

What does this paragraph teach us? (1) The Anti-type began with the death of God's Son. (2) Mankind can now come to God in the Sanctuary above. (3) After Calvary Christ would be a Priest to mankind. (4) Sacrificial offerings ceased at Calvary. (5) By His own blood, Jesus has entered once into the Sanctuary on our behalf.

"And then she quotes Hebrews 9:12 [in DA 757:1], which as I read to you in the latest version, translates as Christ went into the most holy place at His ascension. She used the version available to her, which had 'holy place,' which the translators knew meant 'the second apartment,' because 'holy place' is the name given to the second apartment right throughout Leviticus 16, about five times. And it's in Leviticus 16 where you have 'within the veil' used repeatedly. I marvel at the way Ellen White was not afraid to go right against Adventist traditions, right against some things—apparently—she'd written herself. And when here she built an exegesis, she came right within the most precise specifications of Biblical exegesis, of the passage under review. And she pictured Christ going straight into the most holy place, as she has done in these other places."

Several areas are mentioned here that we have discussed earlier, but since Dr. Ford keeps coming back to them, we will review them again here:

(1) "the latest version." We have already seen that the great majority of representative translations render "sanctuary" for ta hagia in every place where it is used in the New Testament (nine times, and all of them in Hebrews), with the exception of Hebrews 9:2, where "first apartment" is the correct term. Again, Ford here quotes from the New International Translation, which is one of the very few Bible translations that consistently renders ta hagia incorrectly as "most holy place." Dr. Ford is less interested in correctness of etymology than he is in proving his own theories.

27 - THE ORIGINAL GREEK OF HEBREWS IS BETTER THAN THE OLD TESTAMENT TRANSLATION CALLED THE SEPTUAGINT

(2) "holy place in Leviticus." Here, as earlier, Ford is pitting the Septuagint against both Paul and Ellen White. The Old Testament was written in Hebrew, the New Testament in Greek. Centuries after the Old Testament was completed (with the writing of Malachi, c. 425-400 B.C.), Egyptian Jews began translating it into their Greek dialect. This work was done disconnectedly by different men over a period of 150 years, and we have reason to believe it was not finished by 100 B.C. Because of a superstitious fiction invented to prove the divine origin of this translation (that 70 Jews separately translated the entire Old Testament simultaneously in 70 days, with total mutual textual agreement and accuracy), the Egyptian Greek translation became known as the "Septuagint" (the "Seventy"). A closer examination of it reveals it to be of diverse character and uneven merit. Some sections were done better than others. Daniel was done so poorly, that it was later discarded from the Septuagint entirely. In some of the Old Testament books, a mixed up order of verse placement is used, such as in Proverbs and Jeremiah. I Samuel differs greatly from what you will read in your Bible, which is based on the Hebrew text.

Here is what a foremost authority in this field tells us about this translation: "The translators seemed to be perfectly ready to make such slight changes or additions as were necessary to clear up the sense of any passage. Indeed it has been claimed that the work belongs properly with Biblical interpretations [commentaries], not with translations [Bibles]. . . They inserted or omitted words and clauses, and added or changed clauses as they saw best . . . In 2 Samuel 6:5, instead of [the Hebrew] 'with all manner of instruments made of fir wood,' the [Greek Septuagint] reads, 'with all (their) might and with singing.' In Jeremiah 15:19, the clause, 'bring thee again,' is read in the Septuagint, 'give thee a habitation.' Ezekiel 23:42, 'and the voice of a multitude being at ease was with her,' is read in the Septuagint, 'And with a loud noise did they sing therein.' . . . In Ezekiel 32:31, 'even the fat and the strong I will destroy,' is made to read, 'and I will keep the fat and the strong.' " —Ira Price, *The Ancestry of our English Bible*, pages 53-54.

The Septuagint is our primary source for the Apocrypha, so highly prized by Rome because of its mention of 'purgatory' and 'praying for the dead.' These Egyptian Jews were what we today would call "modernistic" in their thinking of Scripture and what it should include.

These were the men that translated Leviticus 16 in a way that will support Dr. Ford's strange new theories. Are we to accept the Septuagint translation of Leviticus as the way by which we are to understand what Paul meant when he wrote Hebrews? New Testament Greek—Koine Greek—was very different than Egyptian Greek two to three centuries earlier. Ta Ha-

gia means "the holy places"—or Sanctuary,—not "the most holy place"—or Second Apartment. As we have earlier seen, the word Paul used in Hebrews for "most holy place" was *hagia hagian*—"holy of holies" (9:3). Paul, as he wrote Hebrews in Greek, explains what he meant by his use of words, far better than modernistic Greeks down in Egypt, 200 years earlier could possibly have done.

28 - WITHIN THE VEIL

(3) "within the veil." We earlier covered this in detail. In the King James of the Old Testament, the first veil is translated "hanging," and the second veil as "veil." But in Hebrews, Paul speaks of "after the second veil" (9:3), when speaking about those things which were inside the Second Apartment (in describing its furnishings). Thus indicating that he viewed both curtains as "entering veils" within the Sanctuary, and that if he wanted to speak about "entering the second veil,"—he would call it just that—"second" veil, not merely "veil." Thus if he did not use the term "first" or "second," when speaking of "veil," we must use Biblical knowledge of the Sanctuary work, in type and in antitype, in order to understand which veil is meant. Paul uses the word "veil" three times in Hebrews: 6:19, 9:3, 10:20.

(4) "Adventist traditions." Ford is obviously referring here to the historic,—and as we have seen, very Biblical,—interpretation of the Sanctuary Service given us by our pioneers and confirmed in vision by the Prophetic Gift. Throughout this lecture, Dr. Ford alternates between down-grading the Spirit of Prophecy, or seeking to make it war against itself, as is done here.

29 - THE SPIRIT OF PROPHECY VIEW OF THE SANCTUARY SERVICE

"So let me point out to you that Ellen White clearly teaches that Christ went into the most holy place at His ascension . . . No other Adventist writer would have dared to write some of the things she wrote . . . It was the Day of Atonement from the Incarnation here, she says. Now, please don't go out and say 'Des Ford says, 'The Day of Atonement began at the Incarnation [began at the birth of Christ].'' Please go out and say, 'Ellen White says.' . . . And she pictured Christ going straight into the most holy place, as she has done in these other places."

The above paragraph is a collection of sentences from the preceding several minutes of this lecture. It represents a continual coming back to a basic point—that Ellen White clearly teaches in her writings that Christ went into the Most Holy Place at His Ascension to make the Day of Atonement Cleansing of the Sanctuary at that time—31 A.D.

And so Dr. Ford over a period of some thirty years, has been seeking to locate Spirit of Prophecy passages that would support the theory of Hebrews Nine that he developed while he was still a member of the

Anglican Church (Episcopalian Church, in America). The result is five quotations which he has come up with in support of his ideas, and which he uses as "proof" for his assertion that Ellen White fully believed in his theory of "Christ going straight into the Most Holy Place" at His Ascension in 31 A.D., without at any time ever mediating the Daily in the First Apartment. It would be well if someone would provide Dr. Ford and those who have studied under him with the following passages from the Spirit of Prophecy in order that they may obtain a mature view of the antitypical Sanctuary Service. Much of the material in Great Controversy, chapter 28 ("The Investigative Judgment") is omitted from this listing, in order to conserve space:

The priestly ministry throughout the year in the First Apartment of the Earthly Sanctuary represented Christ's work in the First Apartment in Heaven (GC 420-421). Jesus entered it and began His Mediation in it at His Ascension (GC 420-421, 430), and it continued as a door of hope and mercy by which for eighteen hundred years men found access to God (GC 429), through His priestly ministry within it (7 BC 913, GC 420-421). His work there ended in 1844 (EW 42-43, 250-251).

253-254, GC 429-430) when He began His Second Apartment Ministration (EW 251, 254, 274, GC 421, 428-430). At that time, in 1844, Christ shut the door to the First Apartment and opened the door to the Second Apartment (EW 42-43, 251, GC 429-430),—shut it because at that time He had passed into the Most Holy Place of the Heavenly Sanctuary (EW 254, GC 429-430).

Christ's Ministry within the Second Apartment began in 1844 (Ev 223; EW 42-43, 243, 250-251, 253-254, 274; GC 421-422, 424-425, 429-430, 433, 480; LS 278; 1SM 125; SR 378-379). Christ entered it as foreshadowed in the Old Testament type (GC 424). God the Father entered the Second from the First Apartment in a flaming chariot (EW 55, 92; GC 479), followed by Jesus in a flaming chariot (EW 55, 251). But, specifically, why did He enter it? He entered it in 1844 in order to minister in the sinner's behalf (SR 379), to engage in the last acts of His ministration for men (GC 481), to perform the last division of His solemn work for mankind (GC 421), to perform the Investigative Judgment (GC 480), to perform the closing work of the Atonement (GC 422, 428, 433; SR 378-379), to cleanse the Sanctuary (EW 243, 251; GC 421), and to receive His Kingdom (EW 55, 244, 280).

Just now, Jesus mediates within it on our behalf, as He pleads His blood before the Father for sinners (GC 429), presents His blood before the Mercy Seat (CSW III, 7BC 948, 92-93), and before the Ark of the Covenant for His people (GC 433), and there intercedes for them (7BC 933, CSW 111-112, EW 36), as He offers the prayers of His people to the Father (EW 32). His ministry within it as our High Priest is a wondrously beautiful one (7BC 933, GC 421-436, 479-480, 1SM 343-344). It will be climaxed by His Marriage to the New Jerusalem (EW 55, 251, 280; GC 426-428, 479-480). Within it, Christ performs His closing work as our High Priest (Ev 223), the closing work of the Atonement (GC 428-429), and the Final

Atonement for all who could be benefitted by His Mediation (EW 253).

Within it, Christ is now conducting the Investigative Judgment (GC 479-491), which also began in 1844 (1SM 125, GC 486) and is thoroughly explained in chapter 28 of Great Controversy. By faith, the people of God are to see Christ mediating on their behalf within this Second Apartment of the their petitions in faith to Him as He ministers within it (EW 72), and, in fact, by faith they followed Him into this Apartment in 1844 (EW 255), and it is only those who thus follow Him by faith within it, that will receive the benefits of His Mediation (GC 430), for they realize that the sins of God's people must be blotted out before He leaves it (EW 48).

The Midnight Cry was to prepare God's people to enter with Christ by faith into the Most Holy Place (EW 260), for a Light shone from the open door of the Most Holy Place upon all who would receive this truth (GC 435) but the nominal Christians of the day did not follow Him in and were not thereby benefitted by His ministration (EW 260-261, GC 430, 432). The present Test on the Sabbath could not come until Christ's Ministry within the Most Holy Place began (EW 42-43, 254-256), and, in fact, that Test began after the commencement of Christ's Second Apartment Mediation (2T 693), and as long as He remains in it God's people will be tested on the Sabbath question (EW 42-43). The Third Angel's Message followed the commencement of this final work within the Second Apartment (EW 254-258), and the minds of all who accept this Message are directed to His work within it (EW 254), for the Message of the Third Angel points directly to it (EW 254-256, 260-261). And when the Mediation of Christ within the Most Holy Place ceases, the Message of the Third Angel will cease along with it (EW 279-281).

While Christ remains within the Most Holy Place, a special Atonement is being made by Him for His people (EW 251), for the sins of God's people must be blotted out before He leaves it (EW 48). And now, the time of Christ's priestly Ministry within it is nearly finished (EW 58, 1SM 66-67), for probation closes when Christ leaves the Most Holy Place (2T 691), and in that day many there will be among His followers who will find themselves unprepared as it closes (2T 190-191). Let us then, consider the solemn subject of the Close of Christ's Work within the Most Holy Place (EW 279-280, SR 402-403, GC 613-615): When Christ ceases His Priestly Ministry within it, the cases of all will be forever decided (GC 428, 3 SG 134, 2T 190-191), the destiny of all will have been decided for life or for death (GC 190), and the Door of Mercy will be forever shut (GC 428). Every case having been decided for life or death—salvation or destruction (EW 36, 279-280, GC 613), Jesus will lay off His priestly attire—His mediatorial robes (EW 36, 281, 2T 190, 691, 8T 315), He will put on His kingly robes (EW 281), and His garments of vengeance (EW 36, 2T 190, 691, 5T 690, 8T 315), and will come forth to bless His waiting people (PP 426), return to earth for them (EW 251), and receive His Kingdom (EW 280, GC426-428, 479-480). For Probation has forever Closed—for the Work of Christ within the Most Holy Place is forever Ended (EW 48, 280, GC428, 490-

491, 2T 190-191). The sins of His people have been blotted out (EW 280, GC613-614), and there is no more Atoning Blood within the Most Holy Place to cleanse from sin and pollution (3SG 137).

In view of this, are you prepared for the Cleansing of the Sanctuary, that began in 1844 (Ev 223, EW 243, 250-251, 253, GC 328-329, 399, 410, 417, 421-422, 424-426, 429-430, 433, 480, 486)? It begins with an examination of the books of record (GC422, SR 378), for it involves a work of investigation (EW 280, GC 352, 421-422, 424, 428, 482-486, SR 378) and a work of judgment (GC 352, 422). It results in a cleansing of the Sanctuary from the record of sin (GC 421-422, PP 357-358), by blotting out the sins recorded there (EW 48, GC 352, 421-422, 428-429, 482-486, PP 357-358). It is a cleansing of the pardoned sins of the penitent that have remained on the books of record down through the ages to that time (GC 421-422). Hence momentous interests are involved in the Cleansing of the Sanctuary (GC 490), and in the solemn scenes connected with it (GC 490). This is an actual cleansing, and is accomplished by the removal or blotting out of the sins there recorded (GC 421-422, PP 357-358, SR 378), and this work which began on October 22, 1844 (GC 400), within the Second (EW 42-43, 86, 251, GC 429-430) of the Two Apartments within the Heavenly Sanctuary (EW 32-33, 42-43, 55-56, 250-254, GC 414-415, LS 100-101, SR 377), and was foretold by Daniel 8:14 (Ev 223, GC 328-329, 351-3, 410, 417, 421, 424, 426, 480, L.S. 63, 278, SR 375, 377; 1T 58), and is plainly taught by Hebrews Nine (GC 417-418, SR 377-378), must precede the Second Coming (GC422, SR 378).

30 - NEW NAMES FOR RIBERA'S FUTURISM

"Well, what shall we say about the solution of the problem? The coming of Christ was the end of the world, and the judgment of the world. 'Now is the judgment of this world.' 'Once at the end of the world hath He appeared to put away sin by the sacrifice of Himself.' The coming of Christ was the end of the world, legally, forensically, and all the things that happened in principle with the death of Christ are repeated again at the end of the age, when that which is forensically [legally] true already, becomes in a sensory fashion, manifest. Theologians talk about 'Inaugurated Eschatology' . . . theologians say that somehow the end of the world came with the first advent. And then they talk about 'Consummated Eschatology' by which they mean the real, obvious end of the world . . . 'Consummated Eschatology,' as well as 'Inaugurated Eschatology'. . . There was a judgment at the end of the first advent, and a judgment at the end of the world, and it's not a strange thing that it should do the same thing with the Day of Atonement [place it at the first advent also]. Does anyone here think the goat was slain in 1844? The Day of Atonement is the same as the Atonement. It was the day the Atonement was made, and of

course that points to Calvary. The Book of Hebrews applies the Day of Atonement to the cross of Christ and His ascension into the presence of God. The book of Revelation applies the imagery of the Day of Atonement—and this I have expanded in a recent commentary on Revelation, not yet in print,—but the book of Revelation applies the Day of Atonement to the seventh seal, the seventh trumpet, the seven last plagues and the beginning of the Millennium. Many non-Adventist scholars have seen it, but no church as a whole."

The above statements apply the antitypical Day of Atonement to Calvary, the last days, and to the events after probation closes and Christ has left the Sanctuary (the seven last plagues, the beginning of the Millennium, etc.).

And so we are given more new light from the theologians whose writings Ford carefully studies, in preparation for his class lectures and campmeeting sermons. Contemporary theologians are Ford's weakness. Whatever new thing they think up, he must champion among Seventh-day Adventists. He studies the imaginings of the current Protestant theologians in order to find something new, and then he goes to the Spirit of Prophecy in order to squeeze its concepts into the mold of what he has been reading in the books and journals of modern Protestantism. Then he fills the minds of our young people with this theological nonsense, as he did in this lecture presented to the Associated Students Forum at Pacific Union College.

Yes, there may be truth scattered among all that he brings out from their works, but is this what we are paying him to do—lead our young people over to the writings of the daughters of Babylon? I believe I am safe in saying that we have a more complete collection of inspirational and doctrinal truth in the Prophetic Writings given us, than does any other church in our world today. Why can we not study the rich mines of pure ore in the Gift of Prophecy, rather than cast our eyes upon the desert wastes of modern speculation.

"Inaugurated Eschatology" and "Consummated Eschatology,"—two big words that really don't mean anything. And the reasoning underlying Ford's thinking here is based on but two points: First, what if I could show you from Scripture that Christ could have returned the second time when the Flood occurred — what would that prove? Nothing. It surely would not prove that Bible prophecy could only be fulfilled at the time of the Flood and at the Second Coming of Christ. Second, what if I told you, for example, that there are remarkable parallels between the time of Elijah and the End of the World—the fleeing to the country, the royal death decree, the miraculous feeding, the call to obey the law of God, fire from heaven, the little cloud the size of a man's hand, and on and on (1 Kings 16-17). Would that prove that all of last day events were begun ("inaugurated") at the time of Elijah? As we thus view the two-fold argument that Dr. Ford here advances, but using other Biblical examples in its place, we can see that the issue that he raises is ridiculous. There are many parallels in the Bible to last day events. The book of Esther is full of

them. A remarkable series is to be found within the historical section of Daniel. And so it goes. Men when they turn from the work God gave them to do—working for the lost,—to a strange work—that of magnifying their intelligence before others, seem to lose depth in their thinking.

But it should be understood that at the heart of these cherished speculations fostered by Dr. Ford is a special teaching very dear to Dr. Ford's heart—that of Futurism. The theory that all Bible Prophecy—in Daniel, Revelation, the Sanctuary Service in Antitype, the prophecies of Christ and of Paul—all are fulfilled ONLY at Calvary, and again at the Second Advent or immediately prior to it. We are told, "By their fruits ye shall know them." And we might add, "By their origins ye shall know them." This teaching—Prophetic Futurism—was invented by the Spanish Jesuit Ribera in 1590, only 73 years after Luther's theses were posted at Wittenburg and provided a very welcome method of counterattack against Protestantism. For by use of the teaching of Futurism, Rome could destroy every Bible prophecy that pointed to the Papacy as the Little Horn of Daniel, the Man of Sin of Paul, the Antichrist of John, and the Great Babylon of Revelation. Futurism as a means of interpreting Biblical prophecies is violently opposed to the Historic approach used by our church since the time of our pioneers. With the passing of time Rome carefully trained these offspring of Loyola, and disguised as Protestants who had been educated in the great universities of the land, Jesuit agents worked their way into Protestant churches, their seminaries, and educational centers. And there they introduced their Roman Catholic errors gradually into the teachings of these organizations, until in this our day the beliefs of Catholicism and Protestantism are markedly similar. A hallmark of Jesuit practice is the removing of the Biblical basis of the churches, their distinctive Protestant belief in salvation through a personal relationship to Christ and obedience to Him, and the muffling of anti-Catholic thinking among them. And now through men like Dr. Ford such deceptive teachings are coming into our own ranks. It all may appear very clever and even attractive—but at its heart are errors that will, if accepted, destroy us as a people.

31 - DESMOND FORD VS. THE ADVENT MOVEMENT

"The only thing that holds up the Second Advent is a people who understand the gospel. Once they understand it, they cannot help but spread it. The trouble is we've never understood it. That's why we're so Laodicean. That's why we're marching, marching,—ever marching—backwards. (laughter) Do you know it took us to 1911 before we had as many people as William Miller had in 1844? It took us to 1911. Now the statistics are exploding so, that unless some new thing happened within Adventism, we'll be a forgotten sect—by the turn of the century—or not not long afterward."

We are here told that the entire Advent Movement is on the wrong track. Thousands are being brought to a knowledge of the Third Angel's Message all over the world—but it is all worthless. All of it—a steady march backward to oblivion . . . all because we do not, will not understand the "gospel" being presented to us in this and similar lectures by Desmond Ford. Our entire denomination—destined to destruction within a generation—because we stick with Great Controversy rather than the new light of Dr. Ford, that alone can save us from Inspired Guidance. Resolutely, he points out error in everything that we have and are as a people, that we may arise as one man, abandon the Spirit of Prophecy that has gotten us in this jam, and cast ourselves on the wise counsels of Dr. Ford.

We can learn two things from Dr. Ford's comments here: **(1)** Dr. Ford's teachings are totally different than our own, so much so that unless we accept them we are hopelessly on the wrong track and will be a forgotten movement by the end of the century—twenty years away. So Dr. Ford must therefore have something totally new for us. The complete changeover in thinking that he offers us will be necessary before we are satisfactorily remade into his pattern of thinking. **(2)** We are all marching unitedly in the wrong direction. No one among us clearly shares Dr. Ford's purity of distilled truth. We are all in error, an entire church of some three million people.

32 - THE GOSPEL OF DESMOND FORD

"Christ was on the cross, darkness, signs in the heavens,—the next thing that happened—was that tension was drawn to the Most Holy Place,—because that veil represented His flesh, and when the flesh of Christ was torn, there was no barrier to entering boldly into the presence of God, accepted because of the merits of the crucified Christ. That's the gospel, that's the gospel—so there in the last days of Jesus Christ, the 1260 days of preaching, the polarizing of the people, the anointing of the Spirit, the Latter Rain, the Loud Cry, . the Cleansing of the Sanctuary—He did that in His last days—the attention to the Most Holy Place. They have prefigured the work of His body—it's all taught in Revelation 11, my friends."

This is the gospel without which we will soon be a forgotten sect—the Most Holy Place entered by Christ 2000 years ago.

33 - WHAT HAPPENED IN 1844?

"What happened in 1844? God brought this church back to apostolic privilege, brought it back to the place where it could see the significance of the cross, brought it to that place where it would lay hold of the gospel symbolized by the sanctuary, . . . the message would spread to the world, and Jesus would come and every man's destiny would be decided in the Judgment, "and he

that is holy, let him be holy still, and he that is filthy, let him be filthy still."

You will note in the above passage that the order of events is 1. 1844, 2. Second Coming, 3. Investigative Judgment, 4. Close of Probation. Futurism places the "actual" judgment at the Second Advent, not before it (in the Investigative Judgment), nor after it (in the Executive Judgment). Futurism teaches that probation closes with the Return of Christ and not earlier.

1844 is of significance to Ford only as a pointing back to Calvary and the "Finished Atonement" there. That is "what happened in 1844." Underlying all of Ford's teachings regarding the Sanctuary Service in this lecture, and in his Righteousness by Faith studies elsewhere, is the error of a "Finished Atonement" at the Cross. This concept of modern Protestantism is that Christ overcame on our behalf at Calvary so that we need not overcome today. He obeyed so that we needn't. Obedience on our part is not in any way related to our salvation. In contrast, our historic view is that Christ overcame at Calvary in order to provide us with enabling strength, which He dispenses from the Sanctuary in Heaven, that we may overcome as He overcame, and obey the Law of God. Ford would have us go out to the churches of the land, and unite with them in their message of non-obedience by faith, that having received the gospel of Ford, we may be prepared for the Coming of Christ.

"What happened in 1844?" Dr. Ford does not believe that Christ entered the Most Holy Place in 1844. He has already told us repeatedly in this lecture that this happened immediately after the Crucifixion. Dr. Ford does not believe that the Investigative Judgment began in 1844. He denied the truth of an Investigative Judgment at the beginning of this lecture. He does not believe that the Cleansing of the Sanctuary began in 1844. For part-way through this lecture, he repudiated any connection between the 2300 Year Prophecy of Daniel 8:14 and the Day of Atonement Cleansing in Leviticus 16. What is left? NOTHING. He is correct in considering it an "historical non-occurrence —because for him nothing occurred in 1844. This, the longest time prophecy in Scripture, Desmond Ford has turned into a dead letter. And this too, is understandable, for he has told us that all Biblical prophecies are meaningless mirages designed only to teach the prophet himself a personal something that the rest of us can know nothing about. Fordian Theology, based on its speculative comments, turns the Advent Message into a shambles. And the Advent Message, based on Scripture, turns Fordian Theology into a shambles. They are mutually exclusive. They cannot exist together in the same church. One must go. And who will decide? The people of God will decide, if they will stand up for what they believe and protest the teaching of these errors to our young people and members. "Who knoweth whether thou art come to the kingdom for such a time as this?" Esther 4:14.

34 - OUR SAFETY WILL BE FOUND IN GREAT CONTROVERSY

"Well, says someone, 'Great Controversy doesn't say it that way.' Let me say a few things to you on the Spirit of Prophecy. The best way to underdo is to overdo."

Careful thought will reveal that the strongest opposition to Dr. Ford in our church—is found in the book, Great Controversy. Ford has already written elsewhere that the Man of Sin of 2 Thessalonians 2 does not apply to the Papacy. In common with Modern Protestantism, he would wish that the insights into the inner workings of Rome given in Great Controversy might not be given to the people. And in this lecture he is telling us that Ellen White's thorough study of the Sanctuary Service in Great Controversy, chapters 23, 24, and 28 is incorrect. His only reference to this extensive material is that, it is the "some things—apparently—she'd written herself." And now, he is rapidly coming to the point in this lecture where he will directly attack this book that blocks his way, by declaring that the statements about Bible prophecy given in it, are not reliable. The positions of our pioneers, the teachings of Inspiration—nothing matters. All must be swept aside that Dr. Ford's theories may become the acknowledged standard of the church. I predict that the show down between Ford and the church will occur over our acceptance or rejection of Great Controversy and its inspired messages.

35 - THERE IS POWER IN THE WORD OF GOD

"I treasure the writings of the Spirit of Prophecy. I have tried, tried and tried again, to apply its principles—and failed—a million times—and but for the gospel she reveals—would be most discouraged."

It is difficult for many to realize the actual objectives of Desmond Ford, and the effects his teachings are having in the lives of man—for interspersed throughout his lectures are comments regarding the Spirit of Prophecy and our doctrines which all can agree with. His clear mixing of truth with error, by alternately switching back and forth between them, leaves people uncertain as to what he is teaching, and open to the error which he has to present. That Dr. Ford has error to present and that he is actively presenting it—there is no doubt. This present lecture fully establishes that fact. He is teaching the errors of Ballenger, plus more beside. And now, consider the above: We are told that the reading and practicing of the Spirit of Prophecy will cause failure and discouragement. This is not a correct picture of the result of Spirit of Prophecy study. The True Gospel revealed in it leads to victory and overcoming through the power of Christ. Ford and Brinsmead teach that trying to obey the Word of God will always lead to failure, but that we are instead to rely upon the "gospel" of a

Christ "outside of us" who overcame in our place, in a humanity not attainable by us, so that we need not try to do what we cannot do, and what God does not intend in this life to help us do.

"[In vision] I took the precious Bible and surrounded it with the Testimonies for the Church, given for the people of God. Here, said I, the cases of nearly all are met. . . One stood by my side and said, 'God has raised you up and has given you words to speak to the people and to reach hearts as He has given to no other one. He has shaped your testimonies to meet cases that are in need of help . . . He will make you a means through which to communicate His light to the people.'—5 Testimonies, 664:3, 66 7:2.

36 - THE REASONS FOR OUR FAITH SHOULD BE PRESENTED TO NEW INTERESTS FROM THE BIBLE

"And having said that, I believe we misuse her writings in an abominable fashion. I believe we do things that would have made her hair stand on end, and made her very angry. Listen to what she wrote, that we have forgotten [and then Evangelism 255:2 is quoted]. . How come we bring the Testimonies ahead of the Bible?"

The thought here is that she would very nearly go into a rage if she knew that we were paying much more than lip-service to the Spirit of Prophecy writings. The middle section of the quotation is omitted by Dr. Ford (the fourth sentence), which reveals that she is here speaking about giving our beliefs to new interests to our faith. We are to use the Bible, not the Spirit of Prophecy to prove our points of faith, in the Bible Studies that we give, and we are not even to give too much Scripture—lest we confuse their minds by giving too much at one time.

In one moment, Desmond Ford will heartily praise the Spirit of Prophecy, but in the next, his true feelings will burst forth in strong words and expressions.

If you believe in the writings of Ellen White and their earmarks of Inspiration, and what they have done for your own life, then you will clearly recognize the intentions of Dr. Ford. Recently, on a neighboring farm, a friend of mine saw a coyote drive the flock from their protection, then separate them into two flocks to render them the more vulnerable, and then turn and go in to claim some for himself, when my neighbor stopped him in his tracks. Ford knows he must separate you from the Spirit of Prophecy before he can successfully instill within you his own speculative ideas. He is telling you that his interpretation of Scripture is safer and more accurate than is the Spirit of Prophecy interpretation of Scripture. Think about that for a moment. He knows that the stakes are high—he must separate you from the Testimonies or he can never achieve the coveted position of master-theologian to our church today. But first must come the separation. Will you be separated?

God has sought to confirm His people's faith in the Spirit of Prophecy (ISM 41), which has carefully taught them that which they need (4T 12-13). We are

to follow the directions given us through the Spirit of Prophecy (GW 308, 8T 298), for it has been given us to safeguard us against delusion (1SM 48, 8T 298). Satan works to cast doubt upon it (2SM 91), and men will arise who have more confidence in themselves than in it (4T 330). Its writings will speak as long as time shall last (1 SM 55, 9T 8), and they should be printed and reprinted for the benefit of God's people (CW 26).

"Why do we use the Testimonies?" Throughout this Reply we have used the Bible in support of our historic position, in every case, in Dr. Ford's lecture, where the Biblical basis of our beliefs has been called into question. And in those instances when an attempt has been made to use the Spirit of Prophecy in support of error, we have used these Inspired Words, themselves, as the basis for our Reply. "Why do we use the Testimonies?" Because the Testimonies of the Spirit were given us to read and study and use. "All Scripture is given by Inspiration of God and is profitable for doctrine, for reproof, for correction, for instruction in righteousness." 2 Timothy 3:16. And the Spirit of Prophecy is Scripture, equal with the rest of the Inspired Word in the Bible—equal for personal use and church guidance in doctrine and all other matters that it pertains to—health, nutrition, history, science, clothing, education, methods of evangelism, Biblical interpretation, and Christian standards. When God through His servants speaks on a topic, that topic is given us because we need it, and better than we could obtain it anywhere else. We shall soon refer to scores of passages in which we are urgently counseled to use these special messages for our day, and to apply them to our life and work.

There are only a few such passages as the one found in Evangelism 256:2. In every such case, the reference is to our presentation of the reasons for our beliefs in Bible studies, cottage meetings and public evangelism to those not of our faith. Read the following passages: Ev 255-260, 1T 119-120, ST 669. But we are also counseled to share the Spirit of Prophecy books with those around us. Not only DA, SC, GC, PP, COL,—but other books as well—and even the nine volumes of the Testimonies, themselves! (4T 390) We are not to be ashamed of the Word of God. It is to be our strength, not our weakness. And we are to read deeply into the precious Bible and thoroughly know it as well, just as we are to study into the Spirit of Prophecy. Never are we to set Scripture aside for Scripture.

37- ALL SCRIPTURE IS FULLY INSPIRED AND EQUALLY PROFITABLE

"There is nothing of truth in the testimonies—that is not in the Bible, Ellen White tells us,—nothing. Ellen White did not give us a single point of doctrine. Read sometime "Movement of Destiny" on that very subject . . . The Bible is the only true source of doctrine that is unmixed with error—that sounds dangerous but Ellen White said it (laughter)."

"Let me tell you Ellen White's role: Ellen White's role is pastoral, not canonical. —Not canonical. You have more writings of Ellen White than you have in the Bible. She is not canonical! The Gift of Prophecy is not the gift of omniscience! Adventists think that anything Ellen White spoke about—that's the whole truth, nothing but the truth—but it isn't so."

We have in this lecture a two-pronged attack against both the Bible and the Spirit of Prophecy—first one and then the other, and back again, as you are seeing. —Not adequate, not competent, not thorough, not complete, not authoritative, not accurate, not reliable. This is the message constantly dinned into our ears.

And now Dr. Ford's word to us is that the Spirit of Prophecy is only "half-Scripture." It may be used for pastoral purposes (sweet comfort and encouragement),—but absolutely not for canonical purposes (doctrinal instruction, warning, admonition, prediction, or for accuracy in historical, scientific, chronological, health, nutritional, physiological, or similar areas). It may be good for comforting the ignorant before they die, but that's about all.

And what is all this talk about "pastoral" vs. "canonical?" It is nothing but imagined theological terms that Ford and his friends and students dreamed up as a means of avoiding the Straight Testimony in their own lives and in relation to what they are teaching. Are the terms Scriptural? "Pastor" is found nine times in the Bible (K.J.V.) and means "shepherd" as a guide to sheep or to men. And can you imagine a pastor who does not admonish, instruct, or give doctrinal information? They cannot be separated.

You will not find the word "canon" or "canonical" anywhere in the Bible or the Spirit of Prophecy. The term "canonization" has reference to the acceptance by the Jewish people of the divine origin and authority of the Old Testament Scriptures. Later, this occurred again among the Christians, as they accepted the New Testament books as Inspired. And so what does "canonization" mean to us? Do you accept the Spirit of Prophecy as Inspired by God? Then you accept it as "Canonical." Does Dr. Ford accept the Spirit of Prophecy as fully Inspired of God?—No, he does not. In fact he goes to great lengths to convince us of its general incompetence. Then for him it is "not canonical." And then he quickly tells what he especially means by this: He tells us that the precious Spirit of Prophecy is not good for doctrinal truth, or for accuracy in regard to anything that it speaks about. Thank you, Dr. Ford, for telling us where you stand in this matter. Your rejection of the Spirit of Prophecy enables us the more clearly to reject your specious errors.

I first ran into this argument, but not under these terms, at our Seminary in 1958, when Martin and Barnhouse were visiting next door with some of our leadership in the General Conference building. In order that we might more fully conform with the Protestant churches, the teaching was introduced at that time that the Spirit of Prophecy is not Inspired to the degree that the Bible is Inspired. But no Scriptural

evidence for this assertion was ever forthcoming. Our only safety in this matter is to understand the Nature of Inspiration itself. And to do so is not complicated:

(1) To the degree that you and I will submit to God, He will guide our individual purposes, thoughts, and actions. This is Divine Guidance. But we are not Inspired as Scripture is Inspired. (2) One writing or speaking under Inspiration speaks divine truth, with a freedom from error, that is not otherwise possible for mankind to achieve. The prophet is given a message for his time that is of vital concern. None of it is unimportant, none of it is unnecessary. What he presents is urgently needed,—for never in Scripture does God give what is not needed. And if you will read the Word of God with this thought in mind, it will become much more meaningful in your life. (3) There is no such thing as "half inspired," or "partly Inspired." This is only the fiction of men. Such a thing has never existed at any time in human history. A man is either Inspired by God or he isn't. He is either fully Inspired or he is not Inspired at all, in the sense of Scriptural Inspiration. Ford's statements about partly-this and partly-notthat is speculative nonsense. (4) Half-Inspiration is no-Inspiration—and Ford knows it. First he applies it to the writings of the Spirit of Prophecy, and then, as we shall soon see, he turns his guns on the Bible writers, themselves. He must weaken both Inspired Sources in order to be assured that his ideas will bear sway in Adventism. It is for this reason that he is picking, picking, always picking at any and every possible "error" in the Inspired Writings.

38 - THE AUTHORSHIP OF HEBREWS

Example: The authorship of Hebrews. Paul's name isn't on the book. Many non-Adventist commentators, trying by their unaided wisdom to determine its authorship, have assigned it to the apostle Paul, due to the sheer theological depth and the acquaintance with Old Testament sources that it reveals. Who but Paul could produce such a work? This is the conclusion of many men. Now, if Peter had but once identified the author of Hebrews, there would be no question as to its authorship, but when Ellen White tells us eight times between pages 413 and 421 of the book, *Great Controversy*, that Paul wrote the book of Hebrews, Desmond Ford looks with contempt upon such information as being unworthy of his serious attention. Ford believes that the very fact that she would name Paul as its author proves her inaccuracy as an Inspired writer! Is not one moved by the Spirit of God to give information! He will not allow her to say anything deeper than his mind can go. Poor vain mortal! She is not to be permitted to give us any knowledge that Desmond Ford cannot give us—and Ford cannot tell us who the author of Hebrews is. Dr. Ford considers the Spirit of Prophecy to be a laughing stock, and as he personally considers it, so he treats it before others. It would have been better for him in the Judgment if he had stayed in the Anglican Church, rather than to have spent a lifetime trying to bring fallen Protestantism in among the Remnant. Some may con-

sider my words strong, but they are nonetheless correct. We don't need Aaron's today to say, "Poor Dr. Ford. He just doesn't understand. We must be patient with him and give him time." He has had thirty years of time, and he is today taking countless people out of the church. The knowledgeable among us know the truth of this.

Eric Syme, another Pacific Union College teacher, agreed with this error publically before the students, less than fifteen minutes after Ford finished speaking. Syme said, "The authorship of Hebrews will be settled by perspiration, not by Inspiration." (laughter) This anti-Biblical attitude, coming from the lips of Adventist College teachers is disturbing. Are these the men we are supporting with salary that they may corrupt the minds of our youth? Ford and Syme and their kin are determined that Man's Mind is to be the Master of all thinking, all concluding, all truth. This is the pagan concept of the ancient Greeks. And now we are paying men to bring it into our own church.

39 - THE INSTRUCTIONAL AND DOCTRINAL ROLE OF THE SPIRIT OF PROPHECY

Here are some passages to consider in regard to this matter of the Spirit of Prophecy and doctrine, guidance and our acceptance of those writings: First we should consider for further study, passages dealing with the relationship of the Spirit of Prophecy to the development of Adventist faith and doctrine (Ev 2S7, 1SM 41-42, 48, 162, 206-208, TM 24-26, GW 302, 307-307-308, ST 6S4, 8T 297-298), for these reveal the important part the Testimonies of God have acted in establishing present truth among us as a people (Ev 257). Through it comes to the church the warning words of the angel (ST S36-S37), and warnings against fanaticism (L.S. 77-94, 133, MM 103, 2SG 46-52, 75-79, 2SM 41, 1T 66-67, 5T 592, 655-656), and reproof of secret sins (LS 177), pointing out of dangers, errors, and sins of various individuals for the benefit of all (ST 660), and for the reproof of His people (ST 679), and, on occasion, they have saved the Cause from disaster in a time of crisis (1SM 27, 5T 65). The Spirit of Prophecy has been interwoven with the rise and progress of the Third Angel's Message (2SG 297), and it is responsible for the origin and development of many Adventist institutions and enterprises (LS 196). Some falsely accuse the writer of the Testimonies of putting her own opinion in them (1T 234), and others say that her opinion cannot be reliable (3T 313), or that what she wrote was simply human opinion (1SM 38). Some falsely accredit it to no higher source than human wisdom (TM 466), but what she wrote did not originate with her (CM 125), for it was instruction that God gave her (CM 125). The Testimonies are either of the Spirit of God or of the devil (4T 230, ST 671), they either bear the signet of God or the mark of Satan (ST 98), and some by their attitude toward the Testimonies insult the Spirit of God (1SM 27, ST 64-65).

"Satan is . . . constantly pressing in the spurious—to lead away from the truth. The very last deception

of Satan will be to make of none effect the testimony of the Spirit of God. 'Where there is no vision, the people perish . . . Satan will work ingeniously, in different ways and through different agencies, to unsettle the confidence of God's remnant people in the true testimony.

"There will be a hatred kindled against the testimonies which is satanic. The workings of Satan will be to unsettle the faith of the churches in them, for this reason: Satan cannot have so clear a track to bring in his deceptions and bind up souls in his delusions if the warnings and reproofs of the Spirit of God are heeded."—Selected Messages, book 1, page 48 (2SM 78 is similar but not identical).

These writings were given of God to awaken sinners to their duty (5T 667), bring God's people into unity (3T 360-361), fit a people to stand in the last days (1SM 41-42, 45), instruct men concerning the will of God (5T 661), and the course they should take (ST 661). The Testimonies were given to leave God's people without excuse (ST 663), perfect holiness in His people (2T 452-453, ST 662), point out defects of character (ST 234, 674), and sins to be shunned (2T 605, ST 662, 664-665), safeguard God's people against delusion (GW 308, 1SM 31, 48, 8T 298), separate sin from God's people (2T 452-453, ST 662), separate wrongdoers from among God's people (3T 324, ST 676), warn, counsel, reprove, comfort, and encourage His people (LS 199, 2T 605-606, ST 665, TM 42). God has shaped the Testimonies to meet all cases needing help (2T 607-608, ST 667), and is testing His people by means of this Prophetic Guidance (ST 72). Within it is to be found instructions for all of God's people (SD 178), and indeed, they will God's people in with reproofs, counsel, warnings, and encouragements (LS 199, 2T 606).

"There are those who think they are able to measure the character and to estimate the importance of the work the Lord has given me to do. Their own mind and judgment is the standard by which they would weigh the testimonies. My Instructor said to me, 'Tell those men that God has not committed to them the work of measuring, classifying, and defining the character of the testimonies. Those who attempt this are sure to err in their conclusions. The Lord would have men adhere to their appointed work.' If they will keep the way of the Lord, they will be able to discern clearly that the work which He has appointed me to do is not a work of human devising. Those who read the testimonies as they have appeared from the early days, need not be perplexed as to their origin."—1SM, 49-50.

"Those who want to doubt the Testimonies, will have plenty of room (3T 255), and those who do so are on dangerous ground (6T 680), especially those who fill the minds of newcomers into our church with doubts (ST 673), and those who would seek to create prejudice against these Inspired Writings (4T 232). It is the rebellious who will seek to shake faith in the Spirit of Prophecy (ST 19), and it is the false teachers who try to place these statements "in a framework of error" (TM 42, 52), by making these writings a "text-book" in which to locate something to quibble about (1SM 69). Those who seek to lessen faith in the Testimonies are actually fighting against God (1SM 40, 3T

260), and this includes those who work secretly against it (ST 673), by questioning and quibbling (3T 255). But those whom Satan especially uses to undermine faith in the Spirit of Prophecy are men in positions of responsibility among us (ST 670). Satan uses such to cast doubt upon, and stigmatize the Testimonies as false utterances (2SM 285), and to hold them up to ridicule (1SM 42). Men despise the Testimonies because they do not coincide with their own plans (ST 689). The Spirit of Prophecy cannot be rejected or lightly treated without the peril of infinite loss (LS 324-325), and efforts to lessen the force of the Testimonies must be met in the Judgment (5T 19, 677). Ministers deceived regarding the Spirit of Prophecy, will deceive others (1SM 51-52). Unbelief regarding the Testimonies shuts away light from God's people (3T 255, ST 674).

40 - INSPIRATION IS ACCURATE (UNERRING), BUT NOT OMNISCIENT (ALL- KNOWING)

"The Gift of Prophecy is not the Gift of Omniscience . . . And how do we know? Because she often said something different in another book. 'John the Baptist was the greatest of the prophets,' said Jesus, 'among those born of women.'—He didn't have everything straight. He spoke of Christ, 'He'll purge them, He'll gather the wheat into His garner, He'll burn up the chaff with fire—.' And he meant then. He didn't have everything straight. He didn't understand about the kingdom of grace; he didn't understand about the spiritual kingdom. He looked for a material kingdom—and pronto. My friends, the Gift of Prophecy is not the gift of omniscience. Ellen White would be burdened beyond measure if she thought she was supposed to know everything about everything. We don't know everything about anything! (laughter) Everything's related to everything else, therefore you've got to know everything about everything in order to know anything about anything! (laughter) . . . So the Gift of Prophecy is not inerrant. Please sometime read what Ellen White said about her own gift—in Selected Messages, volume 1, the first chapter. My friends, we must understand the nature of inspiration. Inspiration like all the acts of God is beyond our comprehension."

"She often said something different in another book." If Dr. Ford meant by this, that she often gave additional information elsewhere, his point would be meaningless. So he must mean that she gave contradictory information in her different books—and this is not correct, as you and I well know. And then, in order to strengthen his argument against the Spirit of Prophecy, he turns against Biblical prophets as well. "Down-Grade" is the middle name for this lecture. Down-grade the Sanctuary Service, the Investigative Judgment, the First Apartment, the Second Apartment, the Day of Atonement, the Inspiration of the

Spirit of Prophecy—and soon, the Inspiration of the Bible as well.

The key word in his argument here is "omniscience." And what is omniscience? It is "all-knowingness." Ford is here, as earlier, setting up a straw man and then knocking it over, in order that he may fool us into thinking a real man has been successfully challenged. Inspiration is not all-knowingness. Scripture has never said it was, and no one that you or I have met ever thought it was. And such a thought has never occurred as an issue in the theological controversies of past centuries. Who expects Scripture to tell us everything about everything? Who believes that this is what "inspired" means? —No one. And that includes Dr. Ford. He well knows what he is trying to do here. He would have to be very ignorant in theological and church history lines not to know what he is doing. He is trying to destroy the Spirit of Prophecy in our minds by disproving something it never had. This is intellectual dishonesty, and in view of what it is accomplishing, it is also a wicked act. And what is his conclusion? The Spirit of Prophecy is not omniscient, therefore it is not "inerrant." We will speak more about this shortly, since Dr. Ford has much more to say about it. What is "inerrant" and "infallible?" Inerrant means "free from error." Infallible means "not fallible [erring], exempt from liability to error." Ford says that because the Inspired Word is not "all-knowing," therefore it is "erring." This is not true. No passage given by Inspiration of God is "all-knowing" (by Ford's correct definition—knowing all about everything in the world), but it is unerring—it is free from error.

41 - 1SM CHAPTER 1 AFFIRMS PROPHETIC ACCURACY AND WARNS AGAINST SPECULATION OVER INSPIRATION

Dr. Ford tells us to read 1 Selected Messages, the first chapter. Well let's do so. This chapter tells us two things: (1) There have been and will again be men who will try to twist the Bible and Spirit of Prophecy to mean whatever they want it to mean, or lacking this, will down-grade its inspiration and enjoy pointing out its "errors." (Read 1SM 16:1, 17:1-18:1, 19:1-2, 23:1). And this includes men who try "measuring by their finite rule that which is inspired and that which is not inspired," who instead should "cover their faces," for "they are in the presence of God and holy angels." (1SM 17:1) And it includes Adventist college teachers who teach that there are "differences in degrees of inspiration." (Read 1SM 23:1 and footnote) —This is exactly what Desmond Ford is teaching ("canonical and non-canonical inspiration").

Then, (2), this chapter tells us more clearly than anywhere else inherent weaknesses in Bible transcription and our reading of it—but it doesn't say what Dr. Ford wants it to say. He wants us to believe that Bible and Spirit of Prophecy are erring. But we are never told here or elsewhere that the Inspired Word has error—only that it came to us through hu-

man language (19:3), imperfect human language—imperfect in that different meanings can be applied to the same word (20:2), and though imperfect human speech was used, the Inspired writers used the best expressions they could find in order to convey their message (22:3). The Word was given as we need it (19:4-20:1), though not always in exact order of sequence in which it happened (20:1). The men were inspired and their utterances were inspired (21:2), and what they said revealed their individual personality in writing (22:0-2), and indeed, there is a variety of insight given throughout the Scriptures (21:3-22:0). In order to reach us, copies were made, and copyist errors could occur (16:2). And now as men come to the Word, they bring with them their imperfections of understanding their human language (19:3), and they come with different viewpoints and levels of prior understanding (20:3-21:0). But in all that you have read, there is no fault with the Inspired Word itself. There is no error in it, though we may attach error to it, and interpret error into it.

42 - SCRIPTURE IS IN FALLIBLE

Earlier, knowing that the meaning of ta hagia was the key to Hebrews Nine, Dr. Ford told us that we cannot know what it means—and then proceeded to tell us repeatedly how he thought it should be translated. And in this part of the lecture, knowing that the meaning of Inspiration is the key to our acceptance or rejection of the Spirit of Prophecy passages that oppose him, he tells us that Inspiration is beyond our comprehension and then he proceeds to tell us of the ways he has dissected and split it up for us.

"My friends, we must understand the nature of Inspiration. Inspiration like all the acts of God is beyond our comprehension . . . The glorious sun under which we walk has spots on it. —Shall we therefore walk in some subterranean channel? Think of the type of man He chose to write the epistles in the New Testament: He chose a theologian. He could have chosen a fisherman but He didn't. Think of who He chose to write the gospels. People that were closely with Jesus Christ in the flesh, or closely associated with those that did. If Inspiration was what many people think, He could have taken any schoolboy, put a pen in his hand, a quill, and said "Write." Didn't do it that way. We need to understand what Inspiration's about . . . Inspiration is not inerrancy . . . The Bible is the only source of truth unmixed with error—which suggests that even the writings of the non-canonical prophets were not inerrant. In fact, if you will apply a strict rule—even the writings of the Bible are not inerrant—and if that sounds blasphemous, that is our official position,—which doesn't make it right, but it makes it respectable (laughter) . . . When Ellen White put out Spiritual Gifts, the first 400 volumes [sic: pages], she said "Please correct me where I've made any mistakes, my memory might have been wrong. Please correct me so I can change it."

Ford is telling us that even though the sun has imperfections we must put up with them,—and use it anyway, and in the same manner, in spite of the errors of Scripture, it can still be a help to us.

And then he discusses a topic that has nothing to do with anything dealing with the lecture. Speakers wander occasionally from fatigue, but even the direction of their straying is revealing. Ford shares with us some of his personal feelings, that the best of all people are the theologians. Not the people who have to work and sweat so they can pay the salaries of college teachers. Dr. Ford says it was "theologians" who wrote the New Testament Epistles, not working men, or tradesmen. Such would not have been qualified. And certainly, He did not call fishermen to this task. But, Dr. Ford, Paul a tent-maker wrote fourteen of the epistles. Paul was so pleased that he could weave goat's-hair into cilicium, and thence into tents, sails, and awnings, that he and Luke mentioned the fact six times in four books of the New Testament. Peter and John, both fishermen wrote five of the epistles. This trade, through which they were trained into the rugged stamina needed for their later work, is mentioned four times in Scripture in three different books. The Bible writers apparently valued men who could work with their hands. The men who wrote the books of the Bible were not learned theologians, but rather, they were humble common men who had experienced a personal relationship with Jesus Christ, and it had changed their lives. God would have liked to use the wise and the talented, but generally He could not reach them. They were too proud. He had to use simple folk whose only wisdom was the Word of God to do the work that needed to be done. Read Desire of Ages, 249:0-251:2, 809:2.

And, again, Dr. Ford comes back to the fallible errancy of the Bible and the Spirit of Prophecy. Not strength in the Word, but weakness,—this is the message Ford brings his students. Elder A.L. White, for thirty years Secretary of the Ellen G. White Estate, in his own Reply to this lecture of Desmond Ford, tells us about this footnote in Spiritual Gifts: "The speaker failed to mention that this statement appeared in volume two, given over to an autobiographical account, for which she made no claims for Divine Guidance. No such statement ever appeared in any other Ellen G. White book. It should be noted that volumes 1, 3 and 4 of Spiritual Gifts presented her first writing on the Great Controversy story, for which, in the volumes themselves, she does claim Divine Guidance. And she does not call for any corrections. It would seem that the speaker [Dr. Ford], eager to show Ellen White's works somewhat short of being reliable, used" this "statement."

But now, it is time to directly face this charge of "errancy" in the Word of God. As clearly as he can say it, Dr. Ford tells us that the Bible and Spirit of Prophecy has had error in it from the day they were written—and that we had better know it. Not here the thought that occasionally a copyist's error may have crept in—but rather the inherent erring nature of Divine Inspiration itself. The thought is that it just isn't very reliable, and we had better realize it.

There is no statement anywhere in the Bible that Inspiration contains error. And if you search care-

fully, you will nowhere find in the Spirit of Prophecy that those writing under Divine Inspiration ever wrote error. This is an idea read into what she wrote—but not actually to be found in it. You may have heard it taught—it was first taught to me at our Seminary—but it is not true.

'So much for fallibility and error-ness. Let us see what Scripture says about its accuracy. The Bible teaches that the Inspired Word is a perfect guide, and men, though fools will not err therein (2 Tim 3:15-17, Jn 5:39, 1 Pet 1:8-11, Rom 15:4, 2 Pet 1:21, Ps 19:7-11, 119:9, 11 and many more). And then we have the testimony of the Spirit of Prophecy. We will find within it not one statement that what men wrote under Inspiration was erring,—but there are many statements given us that what they wrote was unerring: The distinctive doctrine of Protestantism is the doctrine of the Infallibility of the Scriptures (GC 173-174, 177, SR 337). Dr. Ford mentions that "God alone is infallible" (ISM 37, TM 30, 105), but he omits mentioning that "God's Word is infallible" (ISM 416). The Inspired Word comes from God—and divine power is infallible (TM 485). Ulric Zwingli regarded Scripture as an Infallible Rule (GC 173), and an Infallible Authority (GC 173-174, 177), and, indeed, the Inspired Word is an Infallible Revelation of God's will (GC 7). John Wycliffe also recognized Scripture as infallible (GC 89). It was an unerring pen that traced the history that Moses wrote [Genesis through Deuteronomy] with fidelity (4T 370). We must beware of learned men who will try to unsettle minds in regard to the Inspiration of the Word of God (ISM 17). We can expect this of other seminaries and colleges (CT 45), but surely, we should not find it in our own. We may safely make the Word of God our guide and safeguard (2SM 326). It is so thorough and deep that no human mind can exhaust the depth of even one verse (Ed 171). Altogether, it forms a perfect chain of truth (FE 188), and it forms a perfect whole (ISM 26, GC 6).

In view of the above statements, I would be very surprised to learn that our official position as a church is the errancy of Scripture—the "error-ness" of God's Word. And, upon examination, I find that this too is another fabrication of Dr. Ford's. Why does this man dwell so much on the error of Scripture, when he has so much error in his own words? The only official statement of beliefs of the Seventh-day Adventist Church is to be found in its "Statement of Beliefs" in the S.D.A.

Yearbook. Here it is: "1 - That the Holy Scriptures of the Old and New Testaments were given by inspiration of God, contain an all-sufficient revelation of His will to men, and are the only unerring rule of faith and practice. 2 Tim. 3:15-17."—S.D.A. Yearbook, 1979 Edition, page 5. This statement of beliefs is only rarely revised, but a revision is just now in process, and will be completed and made official by the 1980 General Conference. The tentative revision, recently printed in the Review, is very nearly the same as the above, and concludes with the following:

" . . . the only unerring standard of faith and practice."—Review, February 21, 1980, page 8.

43 - LITCH'S PREDICTION WAS ACCURATELY FULFILLED, AND CONFIRMED BY INSPIRATION AS CORRECT

"In Great Controversy, Ellen White, could write about Josiah Litch and his prophecy about August 11, 1940, but Josiah Litch was wrong. The date he chose to begin the prophecy was years out. He forgot about the dropping out of the days and the calendar change, and he didn't understand what the text was saying anyway. The text in Revelation spoke about the hour, day, month and year. It's not a period at all, it's a point—and every Greek scholar in the world knows it. And the Seventh-day Adventist Commentary knows it too—so they put a special note in the Commentary saying, 'Because of the difficulties of the Greek and our smallness of the space we will not enlarge upon the problem.' (laughter) When we put out our lesson quarterly on the trumpets, we said 'There are difficulties here.' Basically, Ellen White's endorsement of Litch was not correct. Litch was wrong. Absolutely wrong. On some topics Ellen White just wasn't told. When she was asked about the daily, she said, 'On this point I have received no instruction.'—but she had written on it in Early Writings.

"Ellen White nowhere claims to be the inspired commentary on the Scriptures, my friends, she said the Bible is yet but dimly understood. And she didn't say in back of it, 'But if you'll read all my writings that problem will be solved.' She said the Bible is but dimly understood. She said when the books of Daniel and Revelation are better understood, there will be a revival amongst us. We haven't had the revival yet. Apparently they're not well understood. And she didn't interpret them for us. She wasn't given to make us lazy! She said, 'Go to the Word.'"

It is very important that Dr. Ford eliminate Great Controversy before it eliminates his theories. Its able Biblical analyses reveals the humbug in his prophetic interpretations.

Under consideration here is the prophecy of the fifth and sixth trumpet in Revelation Nine. Ellen White makes no comment on the first four trumpets, but she refers to the fifth and sixth in Great Controversy, 334:4-335:1 (and note the appendix comment given on page 691:1-3). Dr. Ford tells us that this interpretation of Litch, endorsed by Ellen White, is not true—simply by telling us it is not true. The background of the matter is that Josiah Litch, one of the foremost of the Advent preachers, calculated the time period of this prophecy and declared that in the month of August, 1840, the Ottoman (Turkish) power would lose its independence. He published this in June of 1838. This prediction caused much comment as well as much ridicule. Then prior to the event he predicted it would occur on the eleventh of August, 1840. When the news of the collapse of the sultan's once strong empire was flashed to an unbelieving world, the effect was tremendous. Many looked with

new respect upon the Biblical prophecies of the "Advent near," that were being heralded from state to state and nation to nation by men raised up for this purpose. But of course, it's easy for an armchair detective to deny it all. Just say it isn't true. And so, Dr. Ford has vanquished Litch's prophecy, "with a period and not a point"—or at least he hopes he has.

The five prophetic months of the fifth trumpet (Rev 9:5) describes the harassment of the medieval church by Moslems, and began when Othman I led the invasion of Eastern Rome on July 27, 1299, and ended on July 27, 1449. The sixth trumpet describes the time when the Turks—allies of the Arabs—gained supremacy in the East. Just four years after the commencement of the sixth trumpet, Eastern Rome collapsed when the Turkish Sultan Mohammed II captured Constantinople. Then began a further chapter of oppression of the Christians.

The time of the sixth trumpet is designated as an hour, a day, a month, and a year (Rev 9:14-15). In literal time this would be 360 years, 30 years, 1 year, and 1/24th of a year or 15 days,—a total of 391 years 15 days. As the fifth trumpet ended July 27, 1449, the sixth trumpet would end August 11, 1840. If the sixth trumpet reveals the time of the supremacy of the Turks, then the end of the sixth trumpet would reveal the end of that supremacy. Josiah Litch predicted that Turkey would lose this supremacy on August 11, 1840. Ultimately the Turkish Sultan formally placed Turkey in the hands of the ambassadors of four Christian nations—England, Austria, Russia, and Prussia. The date of the declaration—August 11, 1840.

Dr. Ford can't believe that such could be true, for it would smash his cherished Futurism ideas—that all Bible prophecy fulfilled after Old Testament times, are fulfilled either around the time of the death of Christ or at, or just prior to, the Second Coming of Christ—and at no other time. For this is what he was taught at Manchester University (1970-1972) by F.F. Bruce—the leading theologian of the Plymouth Brethren and the outstanding advocate of Protestant Futurism in our time. Now, what if I were to tell you that the prophetic interpretation of the prophecies of Isaiah 44:24-45:13, and Daniel 5:17-28, given in Prophets and Kings, 529-533 (that Babylon would be conquered by Medo-Persia), were not correct—you would have good reason to laugh at me, for the acid test of prophecy was met—the interpretation was signally fulfilled exactly as predicted.

Josiah Litch's prediction was more accurate than Desmond Ford's speculations have shown themselves to be. Throughout this lecture of October 27, we have repeatedly found erroneous sources, premises, statements, analyses, and conclusions. Elder Litch's prophetic interpretation, although surprisingly accurate, is rejected by Dr. Ford because it will not fit into Futurism ("Calvary and Second Advent Fulfillments"), and is relegated by him to his Great Advent Scrapheap of worthless information.

"The Bible, my friends, is the source of every point of doctrine. Great Controversy is a historical account of prophetic interpretation by Seventh-day Adventists, at the time of the birth of that

movement. She could talk about the signs in the sun, moon and stars—and my friends, the real meaning of those prophecies is obvious to anyone who reads the texts. The great earthquake is the one that shakes every city and village and mountain and island at the end of time—not 1755 in Lisbon. And the falling of the stars is what accompanies the coming of Jesus, and the darkness of the sun is what accompanies the coming of Jesus. Please read the Scriptures—they're as plain as can be . . . Those signs were of God, the earthquake of Lisbon, and dark day and the falling of the stars—they were not the absolute fulfillment of Scripture on the signs, my friends . . . Matthew 25 in Great Controversy is applied to the Midnight Cry in 1844. But read Christ's Object Lessons,—that's not even mentioned. She gives the exegetical meaning. Great Controversy wasn't wrong, my friends, any more wrong than about the signs, but it wasn't complete.

"And still to leave out the cleansing of the sanctuary! If you'll only read Patriarchs and Prophets, written years after. But in the chapter 'The Tabernacle and the [its] Services,' she explains the cleansing of the sanctuary, a cleansing of the earth and the whole universe from sin, at the very end of time. So to apply Daniel 8:14 just to 1844 only, is to misunderstand it entirely . . . When we preach it [the cross] instead of preaching celestial geography [the sanctuary service], then Jesus will come. It was a good American that said, 'God offers every man,' and I might add, every movement, 'truth or repose.' You can take one or the other but you can't have both." (15 seconds of applause)

44 - GREAT CONTROVERSY— OUR MOST IMPORTANT BOOK

"Great Controversy is a historical account of prophetic interpretation by Seventh-day Adventists, at the time of the birth of that movement." This statement by Dr. Ford is a flagrant violation of historical fact. The birth of our movement was in 1844-1845 when the Sanctuary group under Edson, Crosier and Hahn, met and united with the Sabbath group under Bates and the Prophetic Gift group under James and Ellen White. There were very, very few of the distinctive and specialized teachings of Great Controversy that were known or believed by the brethren at the time of the birth of our movement. Dr. Ford well knew this when he gave this comment. Nor were many of its distinctive insights known four years later when the Sabbath Conferences convened at which time our basic doctrinal beliefs were given us through prayerful Bible study and prophetic vision. Great Controversy was not written "at the time of the birth of that movement." As A.L. White pointed out in his Reply to this same lecture, this book, Great Controversy, produced in 1888, and then placed in final revision in 1911, four years before her death, contains her latest views on the subjects it deals with. Indeed, prior to her death, only Counsels to Parents and

Teachers (1913), and the enlarged edition of Gospel Workers (1915) were published. Great Controversy represents one of the richest and most thorough statements of doctrinal truth for these last days, given to Seventh-day Adventists, to be shared by them with a dying world. Anyone who reads this book and believes its messages will not go around telling people that we have received "no doctrines" through Ellen White. Our church today currently publishes few books that contain more doctrine than does the book, Great Controversy. Dr. Ford's statement regarding the origin of this book, is clearly a falsehood, and coming as it does from one who is knowledgeable in such matters, it stands as a deliberate falsehood, given to undermine the one book that directly stands in his way. Many of our people today are not reading the Word of God for themselves as they should, and are all too liable to deception by a good talker with specious reasoning. But if they will set aside their television and radio and their library of cassette sermons and read Great Controversy for themselves they will recognize the error in what Dr. Ford is bringing to them.

Our tract, "The Circulation of Great Controversy," compiled by Elder A.L. White in the early 1930's at the White Estate, and our cassette, "The Story of the Writing of Great Controversy," provides nearly every extant quotation from Inspiration regarding the origin, writing, and importance of this very special book.

"I was shown that . . . the warning [of Great Controversy] must go where the living messenger could not go, and that it would call the attention of many to the important events to occur in the closing scenes of this world's history."—Letter 1, 1890.

"The Great Controversy should be very widely circulated. It contains the story of the past, the present, and the future. In its outline of the closing scenes of this earth's history, it bears a powerful testimony in behalf of the truth. I am more anxious to see a wide circulation for this book than for any others I have written; for in the Great Controversy, the last message of warning to the world is given more distinctly than in any of my other books."—Letter 281, 1905.

"The Lord has set before me matters which are of urgent importance for the present time, and which reach into the future. These words have been spoken in a charge to me, 'Write in a book the things which thou hast seen and heard, and let it go to all the people, for the time is at hand when past history will be repeated.'—Letter 1, 1890.

"As soon as Great Controversy came from the press, it should have been pushed above every other book. I have been shown this."—Letter 39, 1899.

45 - SCRIPTURE IS NOT INCOMPLETE BECAUSE IT DOES NOT MENTION FORD'S SPECULATIONS

"She could talk about the signs in the sun, moon, and stars . . . Some of this seems like chasing rabbits. Ford can dream up problems faster than the rest of us can chase them down. And he seems to think that all this is somehow going to hasten the

coming of Jesus. Take the Falling of the Stars, for example. Dr. Ford, in harmony with his Futurism theory of Bible prophecy, believes this event must occur at the Second Advent. The Bible places it as occurring at some time between the great Apostasy of the Dark Ages—the great tribulation (Matt 24:29, Mk 13:24), and the Second Coming of Christ (Matt 24:30, Mk 13:26). Great Controversy, 333:1-334:3 applies it to the year 1833. Nowhere else in the Spirit of Prophecy is another application given for this dramatic event. Dr. Ford believes that it will happen again, a second time, just prior to the return of Christ. And he says that Great Controversy "isn't complete" because it doesn't mention his idea of a second fulfillment. Both the Bible and the Spirit of Prophecy speak of one dramatic falling of the stars before the Second Advent. And Great Controversy, 333-334 dates the event as occurring on November 13, 1833. Now someone could come along and tell us that there will be six fallings of the stars before the Second Coming, instead of one. I cannot say he is wrong because I cannot read the future. But I can tell him that only one such occurrence is described in Scripture, and that Scripture is not "incomplete" just because it overlooked mentioning the other five that he recently invented.

Patriarchs and Prophets vrs. Great Controversy—Dr. Ford uses here a pattern of reasoning that is unusual. We have seen it several times in this lecture. We might call it a "divide and conquer" technique—divide Scripture and conquer the Church. He did this just before this with Christ's Object Lessons vrs. Great Controversy, implying that because the former did not give the historical background of the Midnight Cry, this meant something very significant. Hebrews Nine he tried to separate from Daniel 8:14 and the typical Daily Sanctuary Service given in Moses' writings, that he might avoid the truth of what Christ did in 31 A.D. Daniel 8:14 and the Cleansing of the Sanctuary was separated from its twin—chapter Seven and the Investigative Judgment, which so fully explains the Little Horn in relation to the Cleansing of the Sanctuary. And now he tries to do it again—tear Patriarchs and Prophets, chapter 27 away from Great Controversy, chapter 23—the two major explanations of the Sanctuary Service. Divide and Conquer. The thought is (1) either she wasn't inspired because she "omitted something," or, (2) the passage that omitted something was really teaching a secret mysterious something that Dr. Ford has discovered for us.

And so it is, that as a finale for his lecture, Dr. Ford tells us that Patriarchs and Prophets "written years after" Great Controversy (A. L. White tells us they were only written five to seven years apart), very clearly leaves the "Cleansing of the Sanctuary" truth out of the Day of Atonement Service. Which is quite a dramatic statement. But it isn't true. Dr. Ford, why do you tell things that are not true to your students? Is there no honest way in which you can disprove our doctrines, that you must use dishonest ways? Carefully read Patriarchs and Prophets, the chapter on "The Tabernacle and its Services," the pages dealing with the Day of Atonement: 348:1, 354:2-356:0 for the Cleansing of the Sanctuary in type in the earthly Day of Atonement, and pages 357:2-358:1 for the

Cleansing of the Sanctuary in antitype on the Day of Atonement in the great Sanctuary above. The cleansing of the Heavenly Sanctuary from sin in the final atonement is clearly taught here—the same truth that is taught in Great Controversy, 418:1-422:1. The Sanctuary is cleansed of sin (cf. Lev 16:19, 29-34). And it results in the Scapegoat Transaction, by which the sin removed from the records of the Sanctuary are accounted to Satan, and he with his followers are forever destroyed, as described in both books (PP 358:2-3, GC 419:2, 422:2, Lev 16:20-22). Patriarchs and Prophets does not have a different teaching on the Cleansing of the Sanctuary than is to be found in Great Controversy. Both teach a cleansing of the Heavenly Sanctuary, followed by the destruction of sin and sinners on earth. Dr. Ford and I are inadequate in our thinking, but the Bible and Spirit of Prophecy never are. They provide us with a complete system of truth.

"So to apply Daniel 8:14 just to 1844 only, is to misunderstand it entirely." And Dr. Ford does just this—after thirty years of study, he misunderstands it entirely. We do not apply Daniel 8:14 "just to 1844." We believe it began in 1844, continues today, and will soon pass to the living. We as a people do not believe that the Cleansing of the Sanctuary was an event that took place nearly 140 years ago.

46 - SCRIPTURE EXPLAINS SCRIPTURE

The Midnight Cry took place between the time Samuel Snow delivered his first Exeter sermon and the Great Disappointment (August 12 to October 22, 1844). Dr. Ford is here referring to the fact that both Great Controversy and Christ's Object Lessons mentions the parable of the Ten Virgins (Matt 25:1-10), but that while Great Controversy explains the Midnight Cry in its historical setting, Christ's Object Lessons does not. The topic is mentioned on page 412:1 of Christ Object Lessons. Why did not this page also provide the historical background of this very important event? First, why would it have to? It was already thoroughly covered in Great Controversy. Second, it couldn't have explained the topic on this page. Where in Great Controversy is the historical background of the Midnight Cry given? It is given in chapters 18, 19, 20, 21, 22, 23, and 24—spanning a range of 116 pages. And it is not possible for a competent writer to explain this event to a non-Adventist without explaining the entire Millerite Movement. Christ's Object Lessons was written as a book on the parables of Christ, to be sold as a colporteur book to relieve the indebtedness on our church schools at the turn of the century. How could this relatively small book (in comparison with the size of Great Controversy), properly deal with such an extensive subject in a book on parables? Why should it deal with this subject? Read what Great Controversy tells about this topic—and then consider whether you could have explained it to one not of our faith in less than twenty to fifty pages (GC 393-395, 398, 400, 402, 426-428).

47 - THE SANCTUARY IN HEAVEN IS THE KEY TO OUR FUTURE

"When we preach it instead of preaching celestial geography, then Jesus will come." The Third Angel points us to the Heavenly Sanctuary, that we may see our work at this time of earth's history. When we preach it instead of theological speculation, then Jesus will return.

"The subject of the Sanctuary was the key which unlocked the mystery of the disappointment of 1844. It opened to view a complete system of truth, connected and harmonious, showing that God's hand had directed the Great Advent Movement, and revealing present duty as it brought to light the position and work of His people . . . Light from the Sanctuary illumined the past, the present, and the future."—Great Controversy, 423:1.

"The Third Angel closes his Message thus: 'Here is the patience of the saints: here are they that keep the Commandments of God, and the Faith of Jesus.' As he repeated these words, he pointed to the Heavenly Sanctuary. The minds of all who embrace this message are directed to the Most Holy Place where Jesus stands before the ark, making His Final Atonement. . . I saw the Third Angel pointing upward, showing the disappointed ones the way to the holiest of the Heavenly Sanctuary. As they by faith enter the Most Holy, they find Jesus, and hope and joy spring up anew . . . Many who embraced the Third Message had not had an experience in the two former Messages. Satan understood this, and his evil eye was upon them to overthrow them; but the Third Angel was pointing them to the Most Holy Place, and those who had an experience in the past messages were pointing them the way to the Heavenly Sanctuary. Many saw the perfect chain of truth in the Angels' Messages, and gladly received them in their order, and followed Jesus by faith into the Heavenly Sanctuary. These Messages were represented to me as an anchor to the people of God. Those who understand and receive them will be kept from being swept away by the delusions of Satan."—Early Writings, 254:1-255:0, 256:2.

"Those who are living upon the earth when the intercession of Christ shall cease in the Sanctuary above, are to stand in the sight of a holy God without a Mediator. Their robes must be spotless, their characters must be purified from sin by the blood of sprinkling. Through the grace of God and their own diligent effort, they must be conquerors in the battle with evil. While the Investigative Judgment is going forward in heaven, while the sins of penitent believers are being removed from the Sanctuary, there is to be a special work of purification, of putting away of sin, among God's people upon earth. This work is more clearly presented in the Messages of Revelation Fourteen. When this work shall have been accomplished, the followers of Christ will be ready for His appearing."—Great Controversy, 425:1-2.

Now, either the Biblical and Spirit of Prophecy view of the Sanctuary is correct or Dr. Ford's view. They both cannot be right. And which one are you going to stand by? Do not think that you may just re-

main neutral for awhile "and wait until the Ford problem blows over," for it isn't going to. For over fifteen years Desmond Ford has been training men into his beliefs, and there are ministers and Bible teachers on two continents—both the Australasian and the North American Divisions—who have accepted Ford-Brinsmead beliefs and are actively teaching his ideas as their own in the pulpits and classrooms of at least two Divisions.

Let me tell you where we are, and then where we are headed.

Here is where we are now: As you may know, following the October 27, 1979 lecture by Dr. D. B. Ford, he was recalled to Washington D.C., to carry on there, under regular salary, research work on his ideas in order that he might present them in a scholarly and complete manner before a doctrinal study group in Washington D.C. next summer, that is to decide as to the correctness of his views. This will probably occur under the auspices of the Biblical Research Institute General Council, of the General Conference under the direction of Elder W.R. Leshner (6840 Eastern Avenue, NW, Washington D.C. 20012. Phone: 202-723-0800.)

Upon his arrival at the General Conference, that body voted that Dr. Ford was to be placed under a preaching ban. This means that he was asked not to speak in our churches until after the question of his orthodoxy was settled. And of course, after reading what he has been actively teaching, you can surely understand why such a restriction would be placed upon him. But soon after this, Verdict Magazine, one of the Brinsmead-Paxton publications, sent out an urgent appeal to its readers to write in to the General Conference in Washington D.C. and protest this ban on Dr. Ford. Many of their readers immediately did so, for they recognized that Desmond Ford is advocating the same liberal views that Robert Brinsmead is preaching. When the letters of protest reached our General Conference headquarters in January and February of 1980, it lifted the ban. Where were the ones who should have written in defense of our historic doctrines, requesting that Dr. Ford not be permitted to preach his views publicly? They did nothing because they knew nothing about it. Those standing by the Bible and Spirit of Prophecy in the church didn't learn about the pressure being applied to our leaders until it was too late. And this is the way things are regularly being conducted at this time. Speaking and writing promotional campaigns by those advocating the new theology of no-Sanctuary, no-Spirit of Prophecy Inspiration, etc., are making deep inroads into our church, through sermons, letters, magazine articles, camp meeting appointments, Conference and Union-wide rallies, while the faithful in the church do little or nothing—simply because they do not realize what is gradually taking place. An important reason for this is that the brethren with the errors are determinedly organizing and working to achieve their objectives. While the faithful among God's people are trying to carry on the regular work in the church and in the world that needs to be tended to. There must be found those today who love the Bible and Spirit of Prophecy who will work earnestly and decidedly to defend and maintain truth

in our midst. For it is clear from the Verdict letter campaign, that our leaders trying so hard to carry on with the forward progress of the work, need our help. Viewing the past we can read the future. Those among us who love the Bible and Spirit of Prophecy must help and encourage our ministers and leaders who are trying so earnestly to stand by these principles. They need our support in standing for the Spirit of Prophecy at a time when many are leaving it—and we had better give them that support in every way possible. It is unfortunate that at a time when we should be aggressively giving our message to the world, we must pause to cast error out from within us. We should rather be unifying in service, than dividing in beliefs, for division brings weakness to the Cause of God. But we cannot, we dare not unite with those who are departing from the pioneer belief of our Movement. This is against Inspired Counsel. When error is permitted by a minority to come in among us as a people, what else can we do but to rise up against it? In 1904, when the Alpha of Apostasy was introduced, we were decidedly told "Meet it!" (ISM 205:3). This must be our experience today. And in view of major errors such as the entire blotting out of 1844 and our Sanctuary Message, who is that man who will dare to say that we should ignore die matter while the Ford-Brinsmead people press resolutely forward?

"With some concessions on their part, they proposed that Christians should make concessions, that all might unite on the platform of belief in Christ. Now the church was in fearful peril. Prison, torture, fire, and sword were blessings in comparison with this. Some of the Christians stood firm, declaring that they could make no compromise. Others were in favor of yielding or modifying some features of their faith, and uniting"—Great Controversy, 42:3-43:0. Read the entire chapter tonight for family worship.

"Get thee up, wherefore liest thou thus upon thy face? Israel hath . . . transgressed My Covenant which I commanded them. It was a time for prompt and decided action, and not for despair and lamentation. There was secret sin in the camp, and it must be searched out and put away before the presence and blessing of the Lord could be with His people."—Patriarchs and Prophets, 494.

The Spirit of Prophecy tells us that we cannot have unity on the basis of error, and indeed, as trials thicken around us both separation and unity will be seen in our ranks (6T 400-401)—and unity is vitally important as we approach the last crisis (7T 182), but God does not call for unity on wrong practices (ISM 175), nor is it to be secured by the compromise of truth and righteousness, with error and wrongdoing (GC 45, SR 324), for unity is purchased too dearly when it is obtained at the sacrifice of principle (SR 324).

So where do we stand now? Unless common folk such as you and I unite with our leaders in requiring the cessation of activity by those who are introducing Ford-Brinsmead error into our academies, colleges and local churches, then we will lose by default. If we together—laymen and leaders alike—will not stand for the Bible and the Spirit of Prophecy at this time by voice and pen, then we are all ultimately losing, for

the advocates of the new theology of Brinsmead and Ford are actively urging their ideas and moving forward as rapidly as they dare.

And what is ahead if you do not stand now for the faith bequeathed to your fathers through the Bible and the Spirit of Prophecy? The experiment has been tried during the years 1963-1979 in Australia. The future is contained in the past. For over fifteen years, laymen and workers in the Australasian Division sat back in placid calm while Desmond Ford's teachings of Covered Sin by Faith, Belittling of the Spirit of Prophecy, Denial of our Sanctuary Message, Cross and Second Advent Prophetic Interpretation, and so forth, began in the early '60's at Avondale College, went through the Conference and Union offices, and into the ministerial ranks, took over our Australian publications (the Australian Signs of the Times, and the Division constituency monthly paper), and were taught to new converts. It grew in the early '70's through incessant hammering at every Adventist gathering on the Australian continent,—and then, quite suddenly, it began to turn on those who still believed the old truths of Adventism. Persecution of those in the church who refused to accept the new view began in earnest in the mid '70's. Speaking appointments, church work, teaching positions, ministerial credentials—all are now dependent in Australia upon conformity to Ford Theology. Colin and Russell Standish have documented the entire historical development of this error in the Australasian Division in their careful study, "The Origin and Development of the Australasian Controversy," obtainable from us.

The hour is a great one. The crisis even bigger. We are told that the church will be sifted by fiery trials (Ev 361, 6BC 1065, 2SM 368, 380), and this will include the introduction of heresies among us (ST 707). We have been told that the church will appear as about to fall, but it will not fall—instead the sinners in Zion will be sifted out. This is the predicted crisis. And it will come to the church over the Spirit of Prophecy. "Satan is constantly pressing in the spurious—to lead away from the truth. The very last deception of Satan will be to make of none effect the testimony of the Spirit of God."—Selected Messages, book 1, page 48. This is the predicted crisis. This is the upwelling of the Omega of Apostasy.

"Have you been doing the Master's business in listening to fanciful and spiritualistic interpretations of the Scriptures, interpretations which undermine the foundations of our faith,— and holding your peace? . . . My message to you is: No longer consent to listen without protest to the perversion of truth. Unmask the pretentious sophistries . . . Brilliant, sparkling ideas often flash from a mind that is influenced by the great deceiver. Those who listen and acquiesce will become charmed, as Eve was charmed by the serpent's words. They cannot listen to charming philosophical speculations, and at the same time keep the word of the living God in mind . . . I call upon those who have been connected with these binding influences to break the yoke to which they have long submitted, and stand as free men in Christ. Nothing but a determined effort will break the spell that is upon them. Be not deceived; many will depart from the faith, giving heed to seducing spirits and

doctrines of devils. WE HAVE NOW BEFORE US THE ALPHA OF THIS DANGER. THE OMEGA WILL BE OF A MOST STARTLING NATURE."—Selected Messages, book 1, page 196-197. It is very important that you read carefully the entire section—1SM 193-208.

God is waiting for men and women who will stand by the Bible and the Spirit of Prophecy at this time of crisis. Make a good decision, just now. May God help us each one to be faithful.

—vf

"Let the truths that are the foundation of our faith be kept before the people. Some will depart from the faith, giving heed to seducing spirits and doctrines of devils . . . We are now to understand what the pillars of our faith are,—the truths that have made us as a people what we are, leading us on step by step."—*Review*, May 25, 1905.

"The theme of greatest importance is the Third Angels Message, embracing the messages of the first and second angels. All should understand the truths contained in these messages and demonstrate them in daily life, for this is essential. We shall have to study earnestly, prayerfully, in order to understand these grand truths."—*Letter 97*, 1902.

"In Minneapolis God gave precious gems of truth to His people in new settings . . . but there was evidence that they knew not what the old landmarks were . . . The passing of the time in 1844 was a period of great events, opening to our astonished eyes the cleansing of the Sanctuary transpiring in Heaven, and having decided relation to God's people upon the earth, [also] the First and Second Angel's Messages and the Third, unfurled the banner on which was inscribed, 'The Commandments of God and the Faith of Jesus.' One of the old landmarks under this message was the Temple of God, seen by His truth-loving people in Heaven, and the Ark containing the Law of God. The light of the Sabbath of the Fourth Commandment flashed its strong rays in the pathway of the transgressors of God's Law. The Nonimmortality of the Wicked is an old landmark."—*Manuscript 13*, 1889.

"When the power of God testifies as to what is truth, that truth is to stand forever as the truth. No after suppositions, contrary to the light God has given are to be entertained. Men will arise with interpretations of Scripture which are to them truth, but which are not truth. The truth for this time, God has given us as a foundation for our faith. He Himself has taught us what is truth. One will arise, and still another, with 'new light' which contradicts the light God has given under the demonstration of His holy Spirit. 'We are not to receive the words of those who come with a message that contradicts the special points of our faith. They gather together a mass of Scripture, and pile it as proof around their assorted theories. This has been done over and over again during the

past fifty years. And while the Scriptures are God's word, if such application moves one pillar from the foundation that God has sustained these fifty years, it is a great mistake."—*Preach the Word*, page 5 (1905).

"God has not passed His people by, and chosen one solitary man here and another there as the only ones worthy to be entrusted with His truth. He does not give one man new light contrary to the established faith of the body. In every reform men have arisen making this claim."—*Testimonies*, volume 5, page 291.

"We are to pray for divine enlightenment, but at the same time we should be careful how we receive everything termed light. We must beware lest, under cover of searching for new truth, Satan shall divert our minds from Christ and the special truths for this time. I have been shown that it is the device of the enemy to lead minds to dwell upon some obscure or unimportant point, something that is not fully revealed or is not essential to our salvation. This is made the absorbing theme, the 'present truth,' when all their investigations and suppositions only serve to make matters more obscure than before, and to confuse the minds of some who ought to be seeking for oneness through sanctification of the truth."—*Preach the Word*, page 4 (1891).

"Satan hopes to involve the remnant people of God in the general ruin that is coming upon the earth. As the coming of Christ draws nigh, he will be more determined and decisive in his efforts to overthrow them. Men and women will arise professing to have some new light or some new revelation, whose tendency is to unsettle faith in the old landmarks. Their doctrines will not bear the test of God's Word, yet some will be deceived. This spirit will not always be manifested in an open defiance of the messages that God sends, but a settled unbelief expressed in many ways. Every false statement that is made feeds and strengthens this unbelief, and through this means many souls will be balanced in the wrong direction."—*Testimonies*, volume 5, pages 295-296.

"Messages of every order and kind have been urged upon Seventh-day Adventists, to take the place of the truth which, point by point, has been sought out by prayerful study, and testified to by the miracle-working power of the Lord. But the waymarks which have made us what we are, are to be preserved, and they will be preserved, as God has signified through His Word and the testimony of His Spirit. He calls upon us to hold firmly, with the grip of faith, to the fundamental principles that are based upon unquestionable authority."—*Special Testimonies*, Series B, No. 2, page 59.

"As a people we are to stand firm upon the platform of eternal truth that has withstood test and trial. We are to hold to the sure pillars of our faith. The principles of truth that God has revealed to us are our only true foundation. They have made us what we are. The lapse of time has not lessened their value."—*Special Testimonies*, Series B, page 51.

"No line of truth that has made the Seventh-day Adventist people what they are, is to be weakened. We have the old landmarks of truth, experience, and duty, and we are to stand firmly in defense of our principles, in full view of the world."—*Testimonies*, volume 6, page 17.

"I saw a company who stood well guarded and firm, giving no countenance to those who would unsettle the established faith of the body. God looked upon them with approbation [favor]. I was shown three steps,—the First, Second, and Third Angels Messages. Said my accompanying angel, 'Woe to him who shall move a block or stir a pin of these messages. The true understanding of these messages is of vital importance. The destiny of souls hangs upon the manner in which they are received.' I was again brought down through these messages and saw how dearly the people of God had purchased their experience. It had been obtained through much suffering and severe conflict. God had led them along step by step, until He had placed them upon a solid, immovable platform."—*Early Writings*, pages 258-259.

"In the future, deception of every kind is to arise, and we want solid ground for our feet. We want solid pillars for the building. Not one pin is to be removed from that which the Lord has established. The enemy will bring in false theories, such as the doctrine that there is no Sanctuary. This is one of the points on which there will be a departing from the faith. Where shall we find safety unless it be in the truths that the Lord has been giving for the last fifty years?"—*Review*, May 25, 1905.

"Satan is striving continually to bring in fanciful suppositions in regard to the Sanctuary, degrading the wonderful representations of God and the ministry of Christ for our salvation into something that suits the carnal heart. He removes its presiding power from the hearts of believers, and supplies its place with fantastic theories invented to make void the truths of the Atonement, and destroy our confidence in the doctrines which we have held sacred since the Third Angel's Message was first given. Thus he would rob us of our faith in the very message that has made us a separate people, and has given character and power to our work."—*Special Testimonies*, Series B, number 7, page 17 (1905).

WITHIN THE SANCTUARY —IS THE FOUNDATION OF OUR FAITH

"I know that the Sanctuary question stands in righteousness and truth, just as we have held it for so many years. It is the enemy that leads minds off on sidetracks. He is pleased when those who know the truth become engrossed in collecting scriptures to pile around erroneous theories, which have no foundation in truth. The scriptures thus used are misapplied; they were not given to substantiate error, but to strengthen truth."—*Gospel Workers*, page 303.

"The correct understanding of the ministration in the Heavenly Sanctuary is the foundation of our faith."—*Letter 208*, 1906.

"The subject of the Sanctuary and the Investigative Judgment should be clearly understood by the people of God. All need a knowledge for themselves of the position and work of their great High Priest. Otherwise, it will be impossible for them to exercise the faith which is essential at this time, or to occupy the position which God designs them to fill. Every individual has a soul to save or to lose. Each has a case pending at the bar of God. Each must meet the great Judge face to face. How important, then, that every mind contemplate often the solemn scene when the judgment shall sit and the books shall be opened."—*Great Controversy*, page 488.

"We should not rest until we become intelligent in regard to the subject of the Sanctuary, which is brought out in the visions of Daniel and John. This subject sheds great light on our present position and work, and gives us unmistakable proof that God has led us in our past experience."—*Review*, November 27, 1883.

"The Sanctuary in Heaven is the very center of Christ's work in behalf of men. It concerns every soul living upon the earth. It opens to view the plan of redemption, bringing us down to the very close of time, and revealing the triumphant issue of the contest between righteousness and sin. It is of the utmost importance that all should thoroughly investigate these subjects, and be able to give an answer to every one that asketh them a reason of the hope that is in them."—*Great Controversy*, page 488-489.

"The subject of the Sanctuary was the key which unlocked the mystery of the Disappointment in 1844. It opened to view a complete system of truth, connected and harmonious, showing that God's hand had directed the Great Advent Movement, and revealing present duty as it brought to light the position and work of His people."—*Great Controversy*, page 423.

"Our faith in reference to the messages of the First, Second, and Third Angels was correct. The great waymarks we have passed are immovable. Although the hosts of hell may try to tear them from their foundation, and triumph in the thought that they have succeeded, yet they do not succeed. These pillars of truth stand firm as the eternal hills, unmoved by all the efforts of men combined with those of Satan and his hosts . . . God's people are now to have their eyes fixed on the Heavenly Sanctuary, where the final ministration of our great High Priest in the work of Judgment is going forward,—where He is interceding for His people."—*Review*, November 27, 1883.

"While Christ is cleansing the Sanctuary, the worshipers on earth should carefully review their life, and compare their character with the standard of righteousness."—*Review*, April 8, 1890.

"For more than half a century the different points of present truth have been questioned and opposed. New theories have been advanced as truth, which were not truth, and the Spirit of God revealed their error. As the great pillars of our faith have been presented, the Holy Spirit has borne witness to them, and especially is this so regarding the truths of the

Sanctuary question. Over and over again the holy Spirit has in a marked manner endorsed the preaching of this doctrine. But today, as in the past, some will be led to form new theories and to deny the truths upon which the Spirit of God has placed His approval."—*Manuscript 125, 1907*.

"In the future, deception of every kind is to arise, and we want solid ground for our feet. We want solid pillars for the building. Not one pin is to be removed from that which the Lord has established. The enemy will bring in false theories, such as the doctrine that there is no Sanctuary. This is one of the points on which there will be a departing from the faith. Where shall we find safety unless it be in the truths that the Lord has been giving for the past fifty years?"—*Review, May 25, 1905*.

"We are in the time when tribulations such as the world has never yet seen will prevail . . . But God has set bounds that Satan cannot pass. Our most holy faith is this barrier; and if we build ourselves up in the faith, we shall be safe in the keeping of the Mighty One. Because thou hast kept the word of My patience, I also will keep thee from the hour of temptation, which shall come upon all the world, to try them that dwell upon the earth."—*Testimonies, volume 5, page 297*.

"The time is near when deceptive powers of satanic agencies will be fully developed. On one side is Christ, who has been given all power in heaven and earth. On the other side is Satan, continually exercising his power to allure, to deceive with strong, spiritualistic sophistries, to remove God out of the place that He should occupy in the minds of men. "Satan is striving continually to bring in fanciful suppositions in regard to the Sanctuary, degrading the wonderful representations of God and the ministry of Christ for our salvation into something that suits the carnal mind. He removes its presiding power from the hearts of believers, and supplies its place with fantastic theories invented to make void the truths of the Atonement, and destroy our confidence in the doctrines which we have held sacred since the Third Angel's Message was first given. Thus he would rob us of our faith in the very message that has made us a separate people, and has given character and power to our work."—*Special Testimonies, Series 8, Number 7, page 17 (1905)*.

"I WAS SAVED ON CALVARY — AND THERE IS NOTHING MORE THAT I HAVE TO DO!"

In February of 1976, representatives from leadership, pastoral work, and laity within the Australasian Division met together under the aegis of the Division Biblical Research Committee, to discuss the teachings of Dr. Desmond Ford. At this meeting one of the Australian Conference Presidents explained to the Committee the atmosphere that within the past few years had developed at Avondale College. He said that the decrying of Christian living—"experience" and walking with Christ—"works" by faculty and theological students at the college had reached such a point that young people were frightened to get down on

their knees and pray to God for power to overcome sin—because they will be called legalists.

One of the church leaders of the liberal "new theology" movement in the Victoria Conference, spoke recently to a group of young Adventist Academy students and said, "If you help an old lady across the road and you feel good about it—that is sin! To feel good about your good deeds is sin!" Those who love the Lord well know that a Christian joy is the natural result of doing good to others. But we are here told that such happiness is sin. One who heard of this, commented, "I wonder how many young people would help a little old lady across the road after that, and risk displeasing God. It seems as if everything is being turned upside down!"

Dr. John Clifford and Dr. Russell Standish tell of an incident in which a young lady at Avondale said to one of them, "I was born again this week!" It is well to help newly born Christians on the upward path, and so he asked her concerning her daily prayer life, and walk with Jesus. To this she replied that Christian experience has got nothing to do with it. "I have been saved. I was saved on Calvary and there is nothing more that I have to do!"

Brethren who have lived with this problem for over a decade in Australia, and have seen its effects in the lives of others, tell us that the fruit of this new liberal doctrine within our church tends to emphasize "faith" to the utter neglect of repentance, or of daily earnest prayer for the help of God to meet the problems of daily life. It tends to destroy a keen sense of the awfulness of sin in God's sight. It creates within its adherents a tendency to make allowance for "a little sin" within their lives, and quietly, relentlessly, it lulls backsliders to a yet deeper sleep—for it gives them a false sense of security in their "ultimate salvation." The Desmond Ford theory of salvation is, something of an "inevitable salvation." And as it is received, it brings with it an exhilarating sense,—that is in reality a sense of freedom from the responsibility of consequences of not obeying God. It is a known fact that backsliders adapt very easily to this new view of Christian living. It requires no particular adjustment to their lives other than initial acceptance of the teaching.

This new theology tends to produce a natural disinclination—and even opposition—to prayerful efforts to deepen one's level of Obedience by Faith. This liberal way of thinking has been found to decrease the likelihood of a victorious Christian life, rather than to increase it. Since the teaching is that the inherited tendency to evil and depravity must remain with one till death, the Christian adopting it can clearly see that all hopes and efforts in Christ for complete deliverance are but idle, if not even fanatical goals. Those who adopt the viewpoint of the New Theology soon drop to this hopeless outlook toward their sins. It appears useless to try to overcome that which is unconquerable.

Unless they can do away with this book or shake our confidence in it, they know that they can never succeed in enlisting the support of the Advent Movement in their false theories in regard to the Sanctuary Message, 1844, the Investigative Judgment, the Third

Angel's Message and Obedience by Faith to the Law of God, the Sabbath and our other distinctive beliefs.

This is due to the fact that Great Controversy alone, of any book that we publish, provides a totally accurate and comprehensive view of what we believe in regard to these important truths.

Because of this towering fact, it is the studied purpose of Robert Brinsmead, Desmond Ford, and Geoffrey Paxton to down-grade the messages of this book in our minds. But because they can present no solid reason for our setting aside the messages of this book, they offer us a variety of errors,—each of which is mutually contradictory,—in order to accomplish this purpose. Consider the following:

(1) Their primary method is to teach what they want to teach, call it "Biblical" and "Reformation" truth to make it sound worthwhile, and then to ignore the Spirit of Prophecy. (2) Cite a statement or two from here and there in the Spirit of Prophecy that is really irrelevant, and then tell us that it means in such-and-such a Ford-Brinsmead error, and then imply that this was her true belief in the matter and that in her dozens of statements elsewhere, we have what she only "apparently" wrote, because someone else changed them. (2) Or they will tell us that Great Controversy teaches only the beliefs given "at the birth of our movement." With the thought in mind that Desmond, down at the end of our movement as a result of his extensive studies, has the distilled purity of divine knowledge for us. (3) Or completely switch, and tell us that the "Alpha of Apostasy was the 1888 Message, and that since Great Controversy was written after it, this book is part of that apostasy, it is in error. (4) Or tell us that Ellen White isn't really inspired anyway, and that whatever she wrote is immediately to be discarded from serious doctrinal study,—for all she gave us was "pastoral" or "homiletic" material—pretty, uninspired sermons, and nothing more.

The truth is that Great Controversy is Inspired of God and profitable for doctrine, for reproof, for instruction in right living in our time in history. Its basic concepts go all the way back into Early Writings and her first visions, and go all the way forward down to the end of her life. The full truth of the Sanctuary, 1844, the Investigative Judgment, Obedience to the Law of God as the final issue and crisis at the end of time, can be fully seen in the 1884 edition of Great Controversy, some time before 1888, and it is fully shown in the 1911 Revision of that book, made under her direct approval, four years before her death. Great Controversy represents the Inspired First Message of our people, the Inspired Middle Message of our people and the Inspired Final Message of our people. In this book is the clearest statement that we have, of the Third Angel's Message—the last message to a dying world. Read and understand and value and share this special book with your loved ones, those in your local church, and with everyone you meet.

THERE IS A TWO-APARTMENT SANCTUARY IN HEAVEN

An underlying teaching of Dr. Ford, one which he brings into his messages frequently, is the belief that there is no two-apartment Sanctuary in Heaven.

Desmond Ford regularly teaches his students that Jesus at His Ascension went directly to the throne of God (which we also believe), but that He entered no building for this purpose,—for Ford does not believe that any structure of any type or size in Heaven exists, which is known as the Sanctuary. He considers it to be a figment of our imagination,—something supported nowhere in Scripture.

Probably the best Bible study on this topic is to be found in Chapter 23 of the book, Great Controversy. Paul tells us in the book of Hebrews that the Old Testament Sanctuary had two apartments, and he carefully describes them and the work done within them (Heb 9:1-5). He is here referring to the Sanctuary that was commanded and built at the direction of God, under the leadership of Moses (Ex 25:8). The specifications for it were given in Exodus 25-27, it was constructed in Exodus 36-38, and it was put together in Exodus 40. "Thus did Moses, according to all that the Lord commanded him, so did he." Exodus 40:16. Again, examining the book of Hebrews, we find "also" in Hebrews 9:1, indicating that Paul had earlier mentioned a second Sanctuary. At the beginning of the previous chapter we find it described as the Sanctuary in which Jesus ministers, and that it is in Heaven (Heb 8:1-2). Studying more deeply into this matter, we find that the Earthly Sanctuary was designed after the "pattern" of another one. This is clearly shown in Exodus 25:9, 40. And Paul tells us that it was "a figure, for the time then present" (Heb 9:9), and that its holy places were "patterns of things in the heavens" (9:23), and that its priests served within it "unto the example and shadow of heavenly things" (8:5). The Sanctuary in Heaven is thus the Great Original, of which the Sanctuary built by Moses was a copy. This abiding place of the King of Kings, where "thousand thousands minister unto Him, and ten thousand times ten thousand stand before Him" was prophetically seen by Daniel in a vision of the last days (Dan 7:10). John the Revelator in vision saw "a door opened in Heaven." He was called to enter it (Rev 4:1), and within he was granted a view of the Temple of God in Heaven, there to behold "Seven Lamps of fire burning before the Throne" (Rev 4:5). According to this view, the Throne was in the First Apartment. for John saw the Seven-branched Lampstand beside it. And He saw One come and stand before the Altar—the Altar of Incense—having a golden censer in His hand, "and there was given unto Him much incense, that He should offer it with the prayers of all saints upon the Golden Altar (the Altar of Incense within the First Apartment) which was before the Throne." Revelation 8:3.

John the Revelator thus beheld the Coming of Christ to the Golden Altar to begin the Daily Mediation with the First Apartment of the Sanctuary in Heaven (Rev 8:3-4), just as Daniel the Prophet beheld the coming of Christ to the Second Apartment of that Temple to begin the Final Mediatorial work of the Investigative Judgment (Dan 7:9-10, 13-14, 22, 26-27). the same work that Malachi saw in Malachi 3:1-3. Thus, in Revelation 8:3, John looked within the First of the two Apartments of the Heavenly Sanctuary and viewed the Mediatorial Work of Christ on behalf of His people. "And the smoke of the incense, which

came with the prayers of the saints, ascended up before God out of the Angel's hand." Revelation 8:4. Then, in his view of the last days, John beholds another entering into the Sanctuary. "The Temple of God was opened" and he looked within the inner veil. upon the Holy of Holies, and beheld the Ark of the Testament (the Ark of the Covenant—for the Ark contained the Testament or Covenant, which was the Law of God), and attention was at that time to be directed to that Holy Moral Standard by which mankind are to be governed (Rev 11:19). Moses made the Earthly Sanctuary after a pattern which was shown him. Paul teaches that that pattern was the true Sanctuary which is in Heaven. And John testifies that he saw it in Heaven. Great Controversy, 415:1. Most of the above study is to be found in Great Controversy, 411:1-415:0. And it should be compared with chapter 24.